

MAULDEN 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.

MAULDEN APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Ms Nicola Bickerstaff	Strutt And Parker	H172, H173
Mr Frazer Hickling	Phillips Planning Services Ltd	H230
Miss Sunita Patel	Bidwells Faulkner	E83, E84, E85, E88

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H050

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
Kevin Sherwood	Highway Access is the big draw back. The Brache on street parking will need to be addressed
Mr P. J. Patmore	Both sites would be infill near to centre of village but the impact of 130 homes would be bad for the rural aspect of the surrounding area. It is not suitable for high density development with its impact on local traffic levels and the enjoyment of public rights of way such as the Greensands footpath which will be swallowed up were the developments authorised.
Nicky Reese	I think that this site would be a good place to develop, as it offers the benefits of a large area which could have a variety of different types of housing. It wouldn't infringe on a major number of existing houses, as the houses to one side of it do not face this land, and the houses at the back are lower than their gardens and won't be overlooked. The site has access for traffic to feed directly to the Brache, which is a main route through Maulden, although the road may need to be widened a bit around the farm area. It would be accessible for the recreation area and George Street, as long as the path that many residents use to walk through from the Brache is left open and it is currently scrub/farming land, so not eating into the Green Belt. I think that if housing has to be built in Maulden, this is a good place to do it.

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
Alexandra Booth	This might be a suitable site for a small development of some additional housing in Maulden. However, Maulden is a village and should not be allowed to grow too big by the building of large developments. There has already been a sizeable development recently with the building of housing extending behind the White Hart public house. A few additional houses in suitable locations may be acceptable but large scale development should be ruled out. Maulden does not have the facilities, including school places etc, to support large development and its character as a village should be maintained.
Eleanor Langdon	My concerns for this site centre around the potential for over-stretching the capacity of the local schools, and I would like to see this issue properly addressed.

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
E M Field	Area of strong landscape value around Greensand Ridge. Dangerous bends on Limbersey Lane cause traffic hazard

Submitted by	Comments
Gretel Nevols	Plot is outside Maulden Settlement Envelope designed to keep Maulden a village rather than a town by building into the countryside. Where the watercourse meets the footpath to the Nth floods considerably, a boardwalk had to be constructed in recent years to enable continued use of the path in the winter months. Access from Cobitts Road would put an unbearable strain on George Street which to the east exits onto Amphill Road immediately opposite the Co-Op, a very busy area with many car movements around the shop with many pedestrians crossing/recrossing the road, to the west George Street is very narrow, made worse by parked cars as properties here do not have off road parking facilities. The proposed roundabout access from the Brache is not a safe area, the road here floods at every rainfall being in the bottom of a dip and the line of site is very limited from both directions, i.e. the brow of the hill in the Brache, and a bend in the downhill stretch of Limbersey lane to the north.
Hilary Hazzard	The Brache is already a rat run for traffic travelling from Amphill, Flitwick etc. through to the A6. The existing lorry park at the top of the Brache means heavy lorries travelling at slow speeds on a narrow road with poor visibility into and out of this site. Further traffic from housing on this stretch of road would just add to the nightmare. I don't think that housing on this site would provide local employers with possible employees. Most people in the area commute to London or other large centres of employment. We will already have the large development of Wixams just down the A6, I don't feel the village would be able to retain any sort of community spirit and would just become too big.
M. L. Carter	This is a site whose access is on an already congested and inadequate road for the number of vehicles that currently use it, to access homes and businesses, and those that use it as a route from the A6 through to Flitwick and the M1.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	The proposed development will not give any additional support to local and social services, the community overall would suffer increased traffic movements which would in turn be dangerous due to the narrow access at The Brache/Limbersey Lane.
Mr A Carter	The Brache is incapable of handling additional traffic such as this development would generate. Part of the land is very wet and unsuitable for housing. The Greensand Ridge path runs through this site, which is beautiful countryside, which would be lost if this development goes ahead.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Site on edge of village adjacent to the Greensand Ridge Walk a site of natural beauty. Also close to farmland and would spoil the overall view. Would pose serious traffic problems in the Brache which is a narrow road with parking and access problems already. 100+ houses would be out of character for the area of the village.
Mr R Hart	The Brache is a small country lane, and cannot take any further traffic. The owners of this land must be fully aware of the unsuitability of this access, and the members of Maulden Parish Council must also be fully aware of this fact. All members of the Parish Council should strongly oppose this development or resign.
Mrs. J M Crisp	Far too big a site, Maulden has very limited facilities. This site is outside the village.
Mrs L Spreadborough	The Brache is already congested enough without building anything else in this vicinity.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs M. Hurn	<p>This site would potentially wipe out yet another attractive, well-loved/used piece of countryside with some wonderful wildlife and trees, shrubs etc. There is also part of the Greensand Ridge Walk in this area which I hope is being taken into account. I am very strongly against this development because it will remove many peoples reason for living in the village...it is the surrounding countryside that should be protected as it is used by so many. Additionally, the local school could not cope with so many more children...it would spoil a very successful village school. So many of Bedfordshire's villages are being ruined by thoughtless development.</p>
Paul Charleton	<p>There are too many houses in this village already. Taken with the other proposals (some of which are certain to be developed in spite of anything we say) your plans and proposals would turn this village into a small town, thus losing all of its character. It is also worth noting that everyone seems to have their greedy little eyes on this area for their sprawling expansions fuelled by corporate greed and socialist dogma - this would include Centre Parks and their outrageous development in Warren Wood and Luton Town FC and their intention of building a football stadium near J12 of the M1. We already have this atrocious Wixams development on the way to Bedford and proposals for eco towns near Marston Mortaine. What is Bedfordshire - just a plaything for developers to print money by the raping of it?</p> <p>We do not want these developments here. Go away.</p> <p>By the way - appreciate that you are just going through the motions with your "consultation" - no attention will be paid to these views - or else they will be belittled as NIMBYism (always a good insult to fling at people who would rather keep the country in the moderately pleasant condition it just hangs on to, rather than turn it into a concrete block or runway extension).</p> <p>Consultation and planning processes will mean nothing - as evidenced by the Centre Parks development which is going ahead in spite of all the protest and case against being overruled by the Govt Minister (Blears).</p>
Paul Coan	<p>The traffic is already terrible, long queues onto A6 plus electric and water all ready over used, never lived anywhere with so many power cuts and water pipe and supply problems.</p>
Peter Gregory	<p>Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.</p>
Philip Allen	<p>Increase the traffic in The Brache, which already has high usage and speeding problem.</p>
Richard Adams	<p>Local infrastructure could not support a development of this size.</p>
Richard Penwright	<p>It would be inappropriate to put housing which would put unnecessary pressure on small village infrastructure. Also it would be placing housing on green belt.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Clough	Limbersey Lane and the Brache already suffer traffic issues, and pressure on domestic supplies such as water and telephone. A housing development on this scale on such a small lane would represent a challenge to this infrastructure, and a risk to the safety of the public using the lane.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H051

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
Andrew Sharpe	Would cause little disruption to countryside/wildlife. There would of course be additional traffic through Sharp close but with only 17 dwellings this would be minimal. If Hall End is to be developed in its own right then this seems an obvious choice.
C R Jackson	Finish development of Sharps Close.
Dr M J A Trudgill	Of all the sites in Hall end, this is the most suitable. Traffic congestion and services are a significant concern.

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
Michael Brooks	This site is a logical extension of the Hedley Way/Sharp Close development. If it goes ahead, please require generous landscaping all around the site so as to avoid a hard edge at the interface with open countryside. However, the bus service along Clophill Road, Maulden, is rather spasmodic with lengthy intervals (and no service on Sundays). A better service is available from Clophill Green/Flying Horse, although this is 700m away. Shop, P.O. and pubs are a similar distance (will people walk this far?). Possible surface water drainage problems.
Stephen M Tatlow	Being realistic about the demand for new housing - and avoiding any hint of NIMBYism - this site (at the end of my road) certainly has potential for developing for new housing. There is also a need for some open space for children. However, key to the character of Hedley Way and Sharp Close is the fact that this is a small cul-de-sac, where children are free to play safely on the road without any significant traffic. To allow access via Sharp Close would completely alter this. I would therefore propose that whilst accepting development of this land for housing (and open play space), road access should be independent of Sharp Close. This would be via the current gate to the land; from Clophill Road immediately adjacent to the end of Sharp Close. This would therefore meet the needs for new housing whilst having less significant impact upon the current character of Hedley Way / Sharp Close.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
B Day & J Day	Further development would add to traffic congestion on the A507 and A6 where long queues develop morning and evening at the Clophill roundabout. Clophill Road is itself already a busy cut through both morning and evening.
Celia Gregory	More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area. The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!! In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.
David John and Maureen Ann Gurney	Our main objection to any development in New Road Clifton is the traffic problem. There is very limited parking. The road is always clogged and passing very difficult. The traffic comes into the village too fast. We have lost pets to this road and now have grandchildren. Access to any site would have to be safe.
E M Field	This would irretrievably alter the landscape and nature of the historic hamlet of Water End.
Eleanor Langdon	I would be concerned about the increased amount of traffic on Clophill Road. I would also be worried about the extra strain on local schools capacity.
Gerald Gough	This land is currently used for pig farming. Access to this site is proposed to be from Sharp Close. Development of this site would increase traffic congestion on the Clophill Road. Sharp close is populated mainly by families with young children who play in the close. Through traffic would pose a hazard.
Kayleigh Pettit	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Laura Varley	To build 16-17 houses on this small site would not be in-keeping with the original development that is already there and I would strongly object to access through Sharp Close, which is a small close with 9 houses. The amount of traffic coming through that small close would disrupt the original residents' quality of life and change it from a small quiet close to a busy through road, changing the whole existing development. I strongly disagree to this proposed development.
Lesley Gough	Congestion, no local amenities, drainage/sewage, size or dwelling, protected wildlife.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs. Maria Ley	At present Sharp Close is used as the Hedley Way/Trilley Fields play area as it is flat for ball games and has very little traffic. Building in this area of Maulden would increase numbers of children playing in the Close as there is no large play area at this end of the village. This could potentially cause a problem (such as a young child being hit by a car) as there would be increased traffic both in Sharp Close and Clophill Road. Also, Maulden Lower School does not have the facilities to take more children at present.
Mark Bodimeade	Before you even think about building on this land why has there never been a roundabout at the turning off the A507 coming into this area as well as speed cameras. I think that this plan to build on this land is going to be a disaster for many reasons. Why does Sharp close have to be a through road into this development when for 12 years we have all lived here in relative quiet and that all the children are safe from the main road with hardly any through traffic, put the entry to this development on the main road if it goes ahead. This village cannot contain all these new developments as the infrastructure is too small i.e. schooling, shops, recreation and also the roads. It seems to me that where there might be a bit of land available let's build on it not thinking about the problems it will create for the village (which will now become a new town). Keep our village a village and not just putting money into developer's pockets.
Mr & Mrs Blackley	Further development would add to further traffic congestion along Clophill Road itself already a busy cut through both morning and evening. This also will add to the long queues morning and evenings on the A507 and the A6 Clophill roundabout. We strongly protest about the destruction of our local wildlife.
Mr & Mrs Morris	Our comments really apply to all Maulden Village. We moved to Maulden from Luton to get away from a town into a nice village with good schools and to a safe and secure close where the kids can play. Adding more housing will add to traffic congestion, fewer places in the schools, which I understand are already difficult to get into, and more congestion means it's more difficult for the kids to play outside. We don't have the amenities to cope with more housing; I had to stay registered with my dentist in Luton as I couldn't get into any in our area. It will create more traffic, especially to the already extremely busy A507. Also if the idea is to create affordable homes in this area, is this going to bring the price of our houses down? We strongly oppose any building in Maulden, especially the land off Sharp Close.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	The Maulden by-pass and link road were constructed to take traffic away from the village. Therefore it would be inappropriate to allow any development on this parcel of land as this will defeat the object of the by pass. Consideration must also be given to the elevated road sections and the noise and pollution this would cause on this busy section of the A507 and the link to Clophill Road. More importantly, the suggestion of a play area surrounded by the road mentioned above would be totally unacceptable in terms of safety, noise and exhaust pollution. The land should remain as a buffer between the A507 and the present development at Sharps Close.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Will cause traffic congestion to A6 and A507 which is already very busy particularly at certain times of the day. From A507 turning right onto Clophill road is a blind corner and this would be exasperated by extra traffic and cause potential accidents. The site is currently used for livestock farming which adds to the character of the area which is basically rural. There are bats, owls and birdlife locally which will be disrupted by extra housing/building. Drainage here is poor with the address River Flitt and heavy green clay. An alternative site would be the disused nursery up Clophill Road which has been unused for years and is an eyesore.
Mr S Fowler & Mrs M Fenton	Directly opposite one of the oldest and best preserved Grade II listed properties in Maulden (Long Thatch 121 Clophill Road)- Council obliged to consider impact on setting of listed buildings - putting the back end of a modern housing estate here would materially affect the setting of Long Thatch. Application inaccurate - land has been in constant agricultural use - market gardening and currently pig farming. Will add to significant traffic issues on dangerous t-junction adjacent.
Mr S Fowler + Mrs M Fenton	Application is inaccurate. Site has been agricultural use (currently pig farming, formerly market gardening) continually. Directly opposite grade II listed building council is obliged to protect (121 Clophill Road) Will add to local traffic congestion Inadequate local transport links to shops, stations, doctors, schools etc. (virtually none).
Mrs Ann Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest; building will ruin area.
Mrs Odell	Hall End is at the furthest end of Maulden towards Clophill. The bus service is inadequate, the road between the bypass link and the A6 is already used as a rat race for road users, we have no services such as shops etc. and surely the local schools are full now. Over populate small areas and problems occur e.g. education facilities, recreation facilities, policing etc.
Neil O'Connor	Increased noise and traffic congestion; no facilities for younger people.
Nick Ley	Being relatively flat and open space, Sharp close and Headley way have become the playground for children in local vicinity, frequently play activity disrupts residents, the police having been involved on a number of occasions in the past. This area of Maulden is in desperate need for proper recreational facilities, a substantial flat open space where ball games can be played, the addition of extra housing in this area is only going to compound the problem we already have. I strongly object to this development, particularly to its proposed access via Sharp close. Access via Sharp close will only cause more disruption from the likes of construction traffic and additional children using Sharp close as a foot ball pitch.
P. Ccuzon	There is enough traffic using this road.
Paul Coan	Traffic already a problem and water and power supplies already stretched, regular power outage and water supply disruption.
Paul Heerey	Previous problems with flooding on the site and general drainage issues will affect the overall area.
Peter Atterbury	Traffic congestion, as tow trucks already use this area. Poor existing infrastructure.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Peter Gregory	This site is mainly outside the village envelope. Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Quentin Cuizzon	I believe the Hall End area of Maulden has already had enough new development already.
R J G Allen	Building on this site would nearly treble the amount of houses in Sharp Close. It would also compromise finally the rural appearance of that area. More so if H193 is proceeded with. A general comment applied to all Hall End proposals: - I fail to see how Hall End can be described as a large village.
Roger Highton	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as the majority of the site is defined as at risk of flooding by The Environment Agency, is outside the defined village boundary and would result in the loss of agricultural land used for cattle and pigs for many years. Only small scale development of 2 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.
Simon Varley	To build 16-17 houses on that plot of land is unrealistic and will not be in keeping with what is already there. The logistics of building i.e. access through Sharp Close is not practical. The additional traffic could be in the region of 32 vehicles, Maulden as a village does not have the infrastructure to cope with too many proposed new houses. The area would be better used as a play area for the local children i.e. football, tennis, netball, basket ball, some kind of all weather area, not 16/17 houses!!
Susan Galtrey	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as the majority of the site is defined as at risk of flooding by The Environment Agency and would result in the loss of agricultural land used for cattle and pigs for many years. Only small scale development of 2 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.
Zoe Gough	Animal live on this land.

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
Ian Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
M King	This site would add to the traffic congestion with the A507 and A6.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H1 16

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
Eleanor Langdon	My concerns for this site centre around the potential for over-stretching the capacity of the local schools, and I would like to see this issue properly addressed.
Gerald Gough	Of all the proposed sites in Maulden the development of this one would appear to have the least impact on the environment whilst having access to local services.
Peter Gregory	An excellent site if you have to put more houses in Maulden. But please note that we have grave reservations that our village does not have enough facilities to cope with more houses!!

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
Alexandra Booth	This site might be suitable for some development although I query whether three storey townhouses are in keeping with the rest of the village (although I accept that the styles of housing in Maulden are mixed and some three storey properties already exist). There are issues with the size of Maulden increasing - no significant sized development should be allowed which will damage the character of the village. There are also issues surrounding the distance from facilities including doctors and schools, and the almost complete lack of public transport for Maulden.
Andrew Sharpe	The only positive factor with this proposal is that it is within the existing boundary of the village.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	The housing density is too high and should certainly not include three storey developments within the village centre. A smaller scale low rise development may be more appropriate. However there are difficulties with the access as Cobbitts Lane is very narrow and the additional traffic movements generated by a large scale development would give cause for concern.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	150 houses excessive in this area. Backs onto open countryside and would be detrimental to the overall view. Would cause considerable amount of traffic through the centre of Maulden and through to Ampthill which is already congested and had narrow streets.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ann Lloyd	Cobbitts Rd is unsuitable as an access for the additional traffic created by 40 houses - the road is already congested, coping with the traffic from the existing houses. Residents in Cobbitts Rd with house backing onto the proposed site of these 40 houses would have their views of the countryside restricted. This field contains underground springs which, if built on, would aggravate the flooding potential which already exists at Sleaford End and George St. If permission was granted, this development would create a high density backland development which is out of character with Maulden village. Leave the village alone - do not destroy it. New villages should be created.
E M Field	Would extend development beyond present village envelope into area of Greensand Ridge of environmental and landscape value.
Keith Leonard	The current access to Cobbitts road area consists of one road that is already difficult to navigate due to road side parking. More than doubling the number households requiring access is likely to cause significant congestion problems at particular times of day. There are no facilities of any type (local shops excepted) that can be reached in any way other than by motor vehicle. Ensure all Brownfield sites are used before developing Greenfield!!
M. L. Carter	Unsuitable access for all vehicles with the current road configuration.
Mr D Martin	Cobbitts Road and George St are not suitable for handling a development of this size with the additional traffic that would be generated.
Mr R Hart	The access proposed is initially off George Street in Maulden. This road is totally unsuitable to take any further traffic. It is used by the school children on their way to Maulden School as is the pathway that would run by the side of the proposed development. As such it is detrimental to the village and should be strongly opposed. Maulden Parish Council must be aware of the unsuitability of this proposed site, and as such should be totally opposed. In my opinion any members that support this proposal or abstain should resign.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Maulden Settlement Envelope and several planning applications for this site have already been turned down for this reason among others. Currently Cobbitts Road is a quiet cul-de-sac with its only exit into George Street, which to the west is a very narrow road made worse by many parked cars and to the east it exits onto Ampthill Road immediately opposite the local shop, which is a VERY busy area with many car movements and pedestrians crossing and re crossing the road at this point. Maulden Lower School is full almost to capacity and is very small and there's no room around it to expand to accommodate more local families. Developers have already just built 46 homes less than 400 metres from this site, Maulden cannot support much more!
Richard Penwright	Building houses in this area will put an excessive amount of use of some small country village roads. The infrastructure would not be able to support this amount of houses. It would also be building houses on beautiful country landscape. Inappropriate use of green belt.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H1 18

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
No name given	The map shows a purple shaded area with the edge very close to the existing road i.e. Steppingly Road. Other possible developments indicated warehouse/storage which would involve HGVs. There is very little road space at the moment with mostly cars. HGVs would make things worse and buildings so close to the road would stop any future widening of this, so you would end up with a situation similar to Ampthill. Roads too narrow and can't be improved. Center Parcs would exacerbate this as traffic flows from M1 junction 12 through Flitwick. Tesco is/was also planning development close to the edge of the road. It is nice that the public are consulted. Better still if someone with local knowledge is in your team.
Alexandra Booth	This site might be suitable for some development although the proposed size is far too large. Maulden is a village not a town and its character must be preserved. Maulden does not have the facilities to support the increased population from a large development. However, some development here may well be suitable given that the land is presently vacant industrial land. I also note that the application states that there will be good use of open space features and that the character of the area will be safeguarded. If that is genuinely the case it lends support to this site.
Andrew Blight	Access to site is limited to Silsoe Road, which is not suitable for increased volumes of traffic - narrow, practically impassable to larger vehicles at southern end. T-junction at northern end is also relatively dangerous. History of drainage issues, infrastructure struggling with current requirements. School is at/above capacity. Site is on periphery of village. Small scale development of a small number of houses would be OK (ribbon along Silsoe Road?) but this site is not suitable for large scale development for housing or employment purposes.
Jill Mather	Site could be developed for housing, but only with vast improvements to drainage, roads, etc. and significant increases in local services such as schools, health and transport.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	The site is in a good location and within the village environment but the number of dwellings is excessive and this should be reduced to a more appropriate scale for its location. There is already employment on the site, some of which would no doubt disappear due to the development. Any development taking place on this site will be in full view from the Clophill Road and therefore steps should be taken to screen the northern and south western boundaries.
Mr & Mrs R Sabey	Consider reduced number of houses, Can the school doctor's etc cope with extra demand! Traffic congestion top of Silsoe road.

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
Andrew P Martin	An estate of 150 dwellings in this location is not in keeping with a village. The site is currently outside the settlement envelope. I strongly believe the balance between new and existing dwellings must be kept and an estate of this size adversely affects the balance. There are already problems with the sewer in Silsoe Road (well above average incidences of blockages).
Andrew Sharpe	Development on this scale will ruin the village. This area is on the flood zone - much of it sits in water after minor rainfall. The increase in traffic associated with it will be dangerous particularly at the junction of Silsoe road and Clophill road, where the school is and adjacent to the green on the crescent where children play.
David Marsh	The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. This is a rural village - there is no need to load the housing requirement for mid Beds onto Maulden with this size of development. This position would be better used for open space for Maulden. 4 Village children did not get into Maulden Lower last September. This situation cannot be made worse by more housing. Local children should be able to go to their local school from an emotional and environmental point of view.
E M Field	The size of the proposed development is totally unsuitable for these rural outskirts of the village and would increase traffic unacceptably.
Isabel Blight	This land is extremely wet and boggy. It would be foolish to build here.
Jacqueline Thorn	I feel a housing development here would seriously impact and damage the surrounding countryside. With no public transport residents would need to use motorcars to access the shop, pubs and school and in today's current car unfriendly climate makes it not very viable.
John C Milligan	It is my understanding that when Russell Crescent was first built that the land proposed for this development was green belt land, as such the proposed development should be ruled out. An additional objection on this and other developments proposed (H178,H230,H225,H230,H279,H280&H281) would place an intolerable burden on the local traffic situation, increasing traffic flow by a massive amount on what is in effect a C-class road. There would also be the problem of a satisfactory supply of utilities (Silsoe road suffers frequent electricity supply cuts at the present time)with these proposed developments placing a massive increase on drainage etc.
Kate Martin	The local school has insufficient capacity for this number of dwellings. Silsoe Road cannot take the traffic that would arise from this size development and there would be an adverse impact on local businesses (nursery etc). The land is low lying and currently flooded in part. Estate would be detrimental to long views across countryside and create light pollution. I cannot believe mid beds would seriously consider this site given my neighbour was declined Planning Permission for a small utility room extension even on appeal. The site also has overhead power cables. Whilst I would not like to see it, ribbon development along the road would be more in keeping.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kevin Powis	I think that this site with 150 potential houses is for a) the site b) Maulden. I also think that it will dramatically make more traffic on Silsoe Road and through Maulden. The junction onto Clophill Road from Silsoe Road will not cope and is dangerous particularly at school times. The school is already full, so where will the children go to school.
Mike Browning	A site of this size is not appropriate for a village of the size of Maulden and therefore in my view any plans for building here should be rejected.
Mr Darren Carter	<p>As this site is on an existing flood zone area, development would be potentially difficult and could lead to widespread problems in the future due to the extra expanses of concrete / tarmac and the removal of much needed green belt.</p> <p>The additional traffic caused by 150 dwellings (at the very least 150 extra families with potentially 300 vehicles) on Silsoe Road would be devastating as the road is not suitable for the vehicles that currently use the road, without the additional burden.</p> <p>Potentially the increase in families (150 extra families = potentially 150 children) would lead to overcrowding in the already stretched local school and poor infant care facilities.</p>
Mr. Allan M. Williams	This land in Silsoe Road would be totally wrong for Industrial & residential use as it is always under water when it rains. The Ground water from land higher up runs down to this area under Silsoe road.
Mrs Carter	This is a very rural position with open aspects across the entire site, which is frequently used by people within the local community via the footpath network. This area would be significantly compromised if there was any development here. The development of this site would not be able to support existing infrastructures as Maulden is currently limited in its other services, and would not be in a suitable location to increase amenities to support that level of expansion needed for long-term sustainability. Silsoe road experiences a significant volume of speeding vehicles at key times of the day and night when children are also walking to the local primary school. This development would further increase the volumes of traffic, and therefore risks to children in the proximity. Finally, the area is frequently boggy and is a flood plain, and therefore would pose a threat to any new development, existing drainage infrastructures and homes if it were to be developed.
Mrs E Smith	The existing infrastructure is totally unsuitable for such an incursion into a rural area.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Settlement Envelope for this area. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? Maulden Lower School is very small and full to capacity with no room to expand. There is no public transport running down Silsoe Road so your estimate of 22 minutes by public transport to reach the GP Surgery in Ampthill (which also does not stand on a public transport route) is optimistic to say the least. There is also no public transport to the village school. The new buildings at the northern end of Silsoe Road have created a blind exit onto Ampthill Road which is a potential Road Safety Hazard at the crossroads on which the school stands.
Mrs. J M Crisp	Far too big a proposed development. Maulden has limited facilities. would create too much extra traffic.

Submitted by	Comments
Paul Whiting	The main part has agricultural use, (cereals, oilseed rape and (once) flax). There is a footpath to the north edge of the site, giving access to the fields beyond. Alongside this footpath is a ditch for tadpoles. Adjacent fields are home to skylarks. Such a large development (especially if in conjunction with H233) would distort the shape of Maulden from penny to penny-farthing. Maulden's shop is sufficiently distant that residents will almost certainly use their cars, increasing the congestion and on road parking outside it. They will also be making longer journeys to the other nearby centres (Amphill and Flitwick) than many of the other proposed developments. Additional traffic in Silsoe Road will be a hazard outside the children's nursery. The existing industrial use includes burning of packaging and will affect the residents (prevailing wind from West). I strongly hope that the council will find that this development will be too large to fit the core strategy.
Peter Gregory	Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Amphill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure does not, and probably couldn't be, adapted to cope with size of development.
Sally Marsh	The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill Road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. This is a rural village - there is no need to load the housing requirement for mid Beds onto Maulden with this size of development. This position would be better used for open space for Maulden. 4 Village children did not get into Maulden Lower last September. This situation cannot be made worse by more housing. Local children should be able to go to their local school from an emotional and environmental point of view. I would like to be consulted on the criteria on which the various sites will be judged.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H122

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
Denis	Despite the greenbelt attached to this land we were able to introduce a relief road to ease congestion and supply the quota of housing for Ampthill in one go I believe that would be preferable to the whole town rather than put a 100 here and a few others there. We will certainly have to consider the impact of additional cars so this would be an excellent option.
Helen Armitage	A relief road to alleviate congestion in the town centre would be very welcome. I should like to see a leisure centre included in these facilities.
Warmingtons	Ampthill is identified as a major service centre and this proposal allows for expansion of the town with the benefit of possible provision of a relief road around the east of the town to take away through traffic from both Ampthill and Maulden. With Ampthill's extensive shopping and schooling facilities, together with good communications, development of this site would be of a sustainable nature. Expansion of Ampthill is likely to impinge upon green belt land and this would be a suitable location for same. The northern area of the site is well landscaped, minimising the impact on surrounding areas.

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
Alan Carowell	This is a massive site and would have a significant unfavourable impact changing the character of the town and is contrary to community wishes expressed in the town plan.
Alan Sprod	I support this proposal on the grounds of creating less damage to the environment than other proposals. If more housing must be built, then this large and featureless plot would be preferable to spoiling more attractive sites elsewhere on the fringe of the town.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	My wife and I disagree to some extent about this proposal, which is why all our "tick box" responses are in neutral and we have compromised on the amber "traffic light": "Maybe". She feels that the whole site is Green Belt land and ought not to be invaded. I feel that, since we have already recommended making Abbey Lane a focus for new housing (partly to prevent Flitwick Road from being overwhelmed), it would be consistent to allow some modest development - say, of a couple of dozen affordable houses - on the Northern side of the Lane, between the existing housing and Abbey farm. Nevertheless, I do agree that the bulk of Site H122 should be preserved as a valuable "green borderland" between Ampthill & Maulden.
Matt Harris	Relief road details would be helpful.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Greenbelt land. Boundary between Ampthill and Maulden must be kept apart. Potential to use as by-pass. If lower school 7.58 minutes why surgery over 30 minutes when just around corner!

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. Russell	Amphill cannot support developments of this size. If it's changed to encourage developments the nature and community will be ruined.
Alexandra Booth	This land has been designated as green belt land - and for a good reason. It is vital that Amphill and Maulden are not allowed to merge. Maulden is a village with its own character and must not be allowed to be subsumed into Amphill. Maulden has already merged with Clophill at the other end of the village and any further expansion on the edges of Maulden would be disastrous. Whilst it is not presently proposed that houses be built on the entirety of the land between Amphill and Maulden this would be the slippery slope and must not be allowed to happen. It would also result in the loss of a large area of green space to the east of Amphill. The Council must stand by its own local plan with regard to designated green belt and find more suitable sites on which to build, of which there seem to be sufficient in the various sites put forward by landowners without the need to lose this crucial area of green belt.
Andy Atherton	It's a beautiful piece of Green Belt. Please leave as is - don't ruin this piece of countryside!
Andy McGowan	Green belt should be protected at all costs. That said, the option of a relief road warrants consideration but Green Belt needs would override the benefit of the relief road.
Anne Davies	<p>Too little detail has been given about this site. Land to the East of Amphill, is a rather sweeping statement! Are you considering a road onto the mini-roundabout at the junction with Ailesbury Road? Or an additional road linked onto Snow Hill or further on, towards Maulden?</p> <p>Considering that this site has the greatest number of dwellings, of all the options, some further detail is essential to constitute meaningful consultation.</p> <p>A new housing site this large, between Amphill and Maulden, will hasten the merger of the two towns, which may be inevitable in time, but if its a real possibility so soon, you need to seek local residents views in an open and transparent manner. I would like the opportunity to comment on this proposal once I can see what it really involves.</p>
B. Dackombe	Infringement of green belt and distinction between Amphill and Maulden.
Barry Wright	Strongly disagree with any relaxation of green belt policy to refuse development permission.
C. Hedges	Site is green belt and will result in loss of local amenity (sports ground). The proposal will effectively merge the settlements of Amphill and Maulden.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Celia Gregory	<p>More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area.</p> <p>The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!!</p> <p>In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.</p>
D. Blackaby	This is green belt. Dividing Ampthill from Maulden. This area too populated now, will only lead to more unrest.
D. E. Mann	Sewerage facilities no good. Too much traffic on estate. Not enough amenities for school - doctors. I object to all the buildings being proposed.
D. Webb	By using this land it would join Ampthill to Maulden, and lose the open countryside.
Debbie Lewis	This land is currently used by many local residents recreationally (rural walks), the east of Ampthill is lacking in green areas and this farm land (green belt) provides a balance at this side of town. Additional development would ruin this beautiful area and leave Ampthill only a stones throw from Malden.
P.A. Duckitt	Road traffic. No easy access to railways and motorways. Unnecessary destruction of green land when sufficient brown field land exists in areas of mid beds such as Biggleswade and Sandy.
E M Field	I would strongly oppose any development in the Green Belt. Ampthill and Maulden must not be allowed to merge.
E. Foster	This would increase the size of Ampthill by 25%. NOT needed. Traffic is already bad.
E. Joy	Keep it green belt. This is why people move and pay the extra live in Ampthill.
Gail Hobday	I feel that development of this site would lessen the distinction between Ampthill And Maulden and is for too many houses which would probably change the character of Ampthill. It would also be a loss of a large amount of open space.
H. A. Braybrook	This area has been designated as green belt and I can see no good reason to change that designation.

Submitted by	Comments
I. Church	<p>Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance.</p> <p>There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands).</p> <p>This is green belt land set up to halt the expansion and ruination of historic towns such as ours. I'm sure Maulden village feels the same, they have their own identity at the moment, this would be lost.</p>
Ian Nutley	Oppose, greenbelt land, lack of school provision. Plus even if relief road built, local roads would be unable to cope.
Jackie Fitch	Amphill, Flitwick and Maulden should be protected as separate and distinct communities. Any encroachment onto the green belt to the east would threaten this and, in particular, would compromise the character and integrity of the market town. The existing infrastructure and local services in the town more than adequately provide for existing local needs within a well-defined area.
Jake Bishop	This would merge Amphill with Maulden, both communities like being apart.
James Gibb	Despite the fact that there might be the possibility of providing a relief road for the town centre, which could be of benefit to us in Church St, I strongly oppose any development in the Green Belt, while other options are available. This development is over the crest of the hill separating Maulden and Amphill and would have a deleterious visual effect from the Maulden side. It would seriously narrow the already small gap between the two settlements.
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We do not believe greenbelt land should be used for building. Existing Amphill town infrastructure, in particular roads which cannot be widened, are overstretched with present usage. Following development at Wixams & other developments, the position will become untenable.
Jerry Fitch	<p>Any expansion of Amphill into the green belt to the east would compromise the character and integrity of the market town. Amphill, Flitwick and Maulden must be protected as distinct and separate communities, and must not be allowed to fall victims to the urban sprawl that would inevitably set in if the green belt were to be lost. The District Councils own strategy does not allow for development of the green belt, so why is this, and other green belt areas, even being considered for any development?</p> <p>Furthermore, this area is much used by local residents for leisure and recreational purposes.</p>
Jim Mozley	The proposed site is just to the East of the last development of new houses that I seem to remember was also in the Green Belt between Maulden and Amphill. That proposal was allowed and the houses now exist. I believe that allowing this development will further reduce the free space between Maulden and Amphill and is not in the best interests of conserving the nature of the two communities.

Submitted by	Comments
Joe Bloggs	Amphill and Maulden are already at risk of merging into one: why risk losing the distinctive characters of two towns, not to mention the views of those who live there? Besides, Redborne school is already full to bust, and there are congestion problems in Amphill town centre. If these plans were to go ahead, I would expect a very strong backlash from the local community which would extend beyond mere NIMBYism.
John Kirkup, Dip Arch RIBA	The intensive development of this huge wedge of land will benefit only the present site owner; turn Amphill from a pleasant country town into an ugly urban sprawl; betray those planners and local elected representatives of the local population who sincerely believed that they were planning for posterity with essential green lungs spacing out residential and commercial developments. What should most horrify the residents who presently overlook this green flank and remaining shred of woodland are the two words mixed development. Amphill is a town of particular historical interest and must stay tightly within its historical boundary. Waitrose is bad enough, the pending loss of Albert Richardson's sensitively appropriate Town Hall - a crime!
K. Hart	Land is green belt and to build would have a huge effect on the countryside and wildlife. The village and town of Amphill and Maulden do not have the schooling/doctors/dentists to support development of this size.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	<p>This development is of a monstrous scale, and is completely disproportionate compared with the size of Amphill.</p> <p>Further it encroaches on greenbelt which provides a buffer between Amphill and Maulden, stopping the two from merging and helps to preserve the distinct nature and attractiveness of Amphill.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that some development must take place around Amphill and I have indicated my support to some of the other more proportionate proposals, I find this proposal totally without merit.</p> <p>I urge the council to stand by their commitment to retaining the greenbelt and to as best as possible preserve Amphill's character by rejecting this proposal.</p>
Kerrie McIntosh	This is on green belt land and will link Amphill and Maulden taking away the countryside that separates the two. Increase in traffic and parking will affect traffic from Maulden, Amphill including Abbey Lane which already is a cut through and can't cope with an increase of traffic into Amphill via Oliver Street etc. Flitwick Rd Maulden already takes a large amount of traffic from and to the bypass.
L. McPheat	Keep Amphill as it is. Green belt land should be kept as just that.
L. R. G. Page	The scale of this proposal would transform Amphill and greatly expand boundaries to the east where poor road access to area proposed. Proximity to conservation area (at northern end). Erosion of greenbelt on a massive scale.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Linda Kitchener	This site falls within the Green Belt and so as the District Council's Core Strategy states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt" I am unable to see why this proposal has even been considered, let alone put up for public consultation. This Green Belt should not be built on for any reason and any use. This proposal is for a site within the Parish of Maulden and yet is for Amphill's allocation - surely development of Parishes should occur from the current infrastructure outwards - not away from a village centre?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Louise Atherton	This is glorious open countryside well used and loved by the local residents of the east of Ampthill. To develop it would reduce this whole side of the town to a concrete mass. i want my children to grow up with good local facilities and the countryside around them - it is why we moved to Ampthill. To develop this land would rob them and all future families in this side of town with that opportunity.
M. L. Carter	This land is green belt and should not be used, to lose land such as this is to the detriment of residents in the surrounding area as it is a breathing space in a busy landscape. It would also almost join Maulden and Ampthill into one long housing corridor.
Marc Henshall	This will ruin the area, build in the big towns, leave the small ones alone!
Margaret Mozley	i am particularly concerned about the gradual erosion of the green belt between Maulden and Ampthill. This also happened 15 years or so ago when green belt land adjacent to the proposed development was used to build a big housing development. If this land was used there would seem to be little or no gap between the 2 towns and it would make the development of Ampthill very heavily geared to the East.
Margaret Wright	The development of this site would mean the coalescence of Ampthill and Maulden. Also encroaches on the green belt.
Mark Smith	This development falls in Maulden & is in the greenbelt & should therefore not be considered.
Martin Stein	Green belt land must be protected. Danger/threat to existing allotments due to access road/increased traffic. Massive development for size of Ampthill.
Michael Brooks	This site is in the Green Belt and development here would erode open countryside between Ampthill and Maulden. Ampthill has limited facilities compared with Flitwick and should not grow much further. Road access in the Ampthill area is poor, with the road to Flitwick (for railway station) and the south highly congested, and the road to Bedford of poor standard with a dangerous bend. The site is poorly accessed by public transport with a very spasmodic bus service along the Ampthill-Maulden road. Even the nearest part of the site to the town centre is some 700m (most of the site is much more than this) and uphill -- people would be unlikely to walk this far. This site should be rejected.
Michael Kirby	I am concerned about access from Exton Close. Water drainage - I am concerned that the lower land near the recycling centre will tend to flood. The "identity" of Ampthill if facilities eroded by development here.
Mike Browning	As the summary states this area is Green Belt and as such I have a very strong objection to building on this site.
Mike Kirby	Ampthill as it is is struggling to cope with the number of people wanting to live and shop here. More houses here will further strain the already bursting infrastructure and further damage Ampthill's identity.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Steven Bowley	<p>There is a very real danger of the Parishes of Maulden and Ampthill merging if this plan goes ahead, creating one giant conurbation running from the A6 to the A507.</p> <p>This proposal goes against the District Councils Core Strategy that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt". The land proposed for this development is designated a green belt area and forms a natural boundary between Maulden and Ampthill.</p> <p>In my opinion is likely that a dangerous road junction would be created on Snow Hill should the land there be utilised for any development, and that the increase in traffic would create increased congestion in both Ampthill and Maulden.</p> <p>The Lower, Middle and Upper Schools in Maulden and Ampthill are already running at capacity and would be unable to absorb the increased number of children that such a development would naturally bring to the area.</p> <p>The loss of the Green Belt land would also mean the loss an area of high recreational usage from the local people who use the many footpaths through this rural area. It would be a great loss to lose this "lung" for the area.</p>
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	<p>If this development was permitted it would drastically reduce the existing natural barrier between Maulden and Ampthill. The suggestion of a relief road is totally irrational as the facility exists at present with the use of Flitwick Road, Maulden. More significantly this is a Green Belt zone and therefore development should not be permitted under any circumstances.</p>
Mr A Carter	<p>This huge site would be undesirable effect of reducing the gap between Ampthill and Maulden. I do not wish to see Maulden swallowed up like that, the green belt land should not be retained anyway.</p>
Mr Keith Staples	<p>This is Green Belt Land and it is therefore unlawful to develop the land and that is what the original law was designed to do: to protect against building on the land and to stop the law being changed and consequently ruining the environment. Also the land has a lot of wildlife; birds, Squirrels, Rabbits and many more animal indigenous to this country and area, which would be destroyed if the land was developed.</p> <p>The land is used for farming essential crops which is essential to the country and contributes to the countries wealth and food stocks and reduces the need to import foods from other countries. Finally, people use this land throughout the year for country pursuits such as walking and relaxing in the countryside. As less and less space becomes available for such activities, so this area becomes more and more important to the people and isn't that is what it's all about?!</p>
Mr M. Wooldridge	<p>This development is more suited to the old station area. The proposed development would be more traffic for Abbey Lane and any traffic from Maulden or local roads would if heading for the M1 would be more traffic for Ampthill town centre. Already too much green belt is disappearing and local towns and villages are virtually joined together.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Matt Cross	I have recently moved from Dunstable because of the terrible traffic congestion and the complete lack of competence of Bedfordshire county & local councils to plan & implement the infrastructure needed before the new house developments were built (Dunstable bypass & A505 to M1 link Rd, etc) that is why Dunstable is now at gridlock and major businesses have moved out of the town. Unless you want traffic at a standstill & your quality of life deteriorated you will resist this proposal at all costs or face having to move as I did!
Mr R Hart	This is green belt and should remain green belt. This is a natural green belt division between Ampthill and Maulden and should stay as a natural division. There are other sites going towards the motorway that are by far more suitable for any development. Traffic has already increased dramatically in this area, and both Ampthill and Maulden will suffer immensely by this proposal.
Mr S Long	Completely inappropriate site, green belt and isolated from existing development boundary.
Mr & Mrs R Sabey	Green Belt. Do not wish Maulden to be joined with Ampthill.
Mr. C. R. Greenstree	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market (?) towns may be worth consideration"?
Mr. L. A. Lowe	A development on this scale would lead to over loading of local services such as shops, in-town parking, schools, surgeries, post office etc. Access to the town centre would be via narrow roads which are already made dangerous by on-street parking. The size of the proposed development would swamp the already difficult parking problems in Ampthill. Loss of edge-of-town-open spaces.
Mrs E. Scott	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Makes mockery of green belt status. 2. In effect would join Ampthill and Maulden into one large area. 3. I chose to live in a rural town not a huge housing development. It would change character of Ampthill completely. 4. Foresee future problems in terms of crime. 5. Traffic problems.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	This site is on Green Belt land designed to compliment the gap between the town of Ampthill and the village of Maulden. To build here would open the way to more development in the area which will finally close this gap and sound the death knell for the village of Maulden. We will be swallowed up and disappear into the town of Ampthill. The Lower and Middle Schools in Ampthill stand adjacent on the same site so your information regarding times to reach the lower school are sadly inaccurate, also to the north of this site the bus runs once an hour if you are lucky and neither of the schools stand on a bus route in Ampthill so your times there are rather optimistic.
Mrs H. Wilson	I think all green belt land should be protected. This area is used for walkers and is local countryside enjoyed by many. If one section of green belt land is built on there is no protection for any green belt land in the future.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Hemmings	It is important that Ampthill and Maulden maintain separate identities- there is a great danger the two will effectively merge over time through development. In addition as this is a hilly area concreting over much of it would surely put more pressure on drainage away through ponds on Ailesbury Road. The traffic through Maulden already drives too fast for the area- with more traffic around the area when Wixams is built surely Ampthill will be under strain with a development here with more traffic coming through the town centre to get out on A507 in MK direction where many people work.
Mrs J M Crisp	Far too big proposal. On green belt which must be protected at all costs. Maulden has limited facilities. This would create lots more traffic. Maulden already has a speeding traffic problem.
Mrs Karen Procter	I expect the Council to stick to their core Strategy that no development will be allocated in the Greenbelt
Mrs Kirby	If this site is developed it will not support any of the present infrastructure. It is green belt and should remain as such, if developed it would merge with Maulden. There has to be plenty of land to develop to fill our needs without using green belt! This should be kept as green belt. The plans are for a far too big development, and will ruin Ampthill, the traffic congestion will be huge even if a relief road is put in.
Mrs Mary P. Wooldridge	The site proposed is near to Snowhill, Maulden which would mean a joining of Ampthill and Maulden. It is green belt land and not well served by roads and services. I would think a better idea would be to develop E68. This would develop employment and consolidate Ampthill's plan as a major service centre.
Mrs P. King	Green belt.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Susan Wardle	<p>The proposed development would require a very large area of Green Belt land that is right on the boundary with Ampthill to be released for development. This is in conflict with the information contained in the Mid Beds District Councils Core Strategy and Development Control Policies: Preferred Options document dated Sept 2007.</p> <p>Under the heading of Preferred Option CS2 – Green Belt this states: The Council’s Preferred Option is that: The existing extent of the adopted South Bedfordshire Green Belt in Mid Bedfordshire should continue to be maintained up to 2021 to contain the outward growth of settlements including Ampthill and Flitwick and prevent the coalescence of settlements within it. The Site Allocations DPD will not consider allocating new development sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>It also states: The emerging East of England Plan considers the broad extent of Green Belts in the region is appropriate and will be maintained. The Council agrees with this conclusion and its Preferred Option is to release no existing Green Belt land for development purposes up to 2021. At the two main towns within the Green Belt, Ampthill and Flitwick, there is scope to accommodate future development on safeguarded ‘white’ land excluded from the adopted Green Belt. In making best use of this land to help meet future development needs, Ampthill and Flitwick’s role as major settlements can be consolidated. Consolidate and develop the role of Ampthill and Flitwick as Major Service Centres, recognising the need to maintain the separate identity of those settlements and the existing Green Belt constraint.</p> <p>If we are to be able to believe what the Council tell us, surely this application must be declined.</p>
Mrs. A. Morris	Mid Beds should stick to its core strategy to keep green belt - green belt.
Mrs. K. S. Tyrrel	This will link Maulden to Ampthill – it’s in Maulden Parish in fact. I am opposed to this because the use of green belt land in these circumstances is completely inappropriate.
N Simmons	Building houses here would bring Maulden and Ampthill too close together. The strain on existing services would be too much. The new estate is always having power cuts because the national grid can’t cope. The sewage farm wouldn’t be able to cope. Nor the Doctors/Dentists. There would be too many cars. People who buy these houses may work in London, making Ampthill even more of a commuter town.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Nick Watson	The size and position of this site is entirely at odds with sustainable development in Mid Beds. The proposed location is on Green Belt land and any development of this land will result in the merging of the boundaries between Ampthill and Maulden, creating a single conurbation which would detrimentally impact on the identity and character of this part of Bedfordshire. Additionally the proposed location is some distance from local services and amenities encouraging the use of cars and therefore impacting on the environment. Existing local amenities, particularly schools would be unable to cope with this growth. I would be strongly opposed to this development.
Nigel Hopwood	Ampthill is not a large enough town and does not have the services or infrastructure to support such a volume of additional houses. Horrendous!
Nigel Pollard	I would be very concerned about any plan that eroded the clear distinction, and geographical separation, between Ampthill and Maulden. NO, NO, NO. I do not agree at all that the potential for a Relief Road is a point in favour of this site. A road through from Abbey Lane to Maulden Road achieves nothing more than the existing Flitwick Road, Maulden already does. Unless a relief road is going to include a tunnel or cutting through the Greensand Ridge(!), I do not see that any North-South relief road will help as it will not by-pass the town centre.
Patricia Douglas	This development would be out of proportion to the existing town. It would go a long way to merging Ampthill and Maulden which would not be wanted by either community. The area is farmland and home to much wild-life. It is regularly used for walking by many people. Even if a relief road were built traffic would still come through Ampthill to get to Bedford and a development this size would generate a lot of traffic.
Paul New	Green belt - no!
Paul ODell	Ampthill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixams town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixams development is so close to Ampthill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
Peter Gregory	Ampthill and Maulden are already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Peter Rayner	I strongly oppose development of Green Belt land in Ampthill. The targets can be achieved by utilising other opportunities for development that do not impinge on Green Belt land. A development of this size will destroy the existing nature of Ampthill as a village community and will put tremendous strain on the existing infrastructure. Traffic into and through the town centre could not be accommodated from such a large and sprawling development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Phil Watson	This proposal will spoil the countryside between Ampthill and Maulden. It will also further erode the distance between the 2 locations. I believe both communities would prefer to ensure their identities as separate places are retained, rather than eventually merge into 1 conurbation.
Philip Field	The use of this prime farmland for 400+ is short sighted and would change the character of Ampthill and overload services. The local traffic system would be further congested by the scale of this development.
R McPheat	Building on this allocated green belt land, with a proposed relief road, will reduce village boundaries and be a negative for future land preservation policies as well as increase traffic and pollution in the area. The proposed development is outside the Ampthill Town boundary.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as a housing site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement.
Richard Holden	Green belt - should not be considered.
Rob McPheat	The area is too close to Flitwick and will lessen the divide between the two towns.
Robert Butcher	Being part of the Green Belt this site should not be considered for any development whatsoever.
Robin Adams	Green Belt land should remain as green belt.
Robin Bartlett	The countryside corridor between Ampthill and Maulden is already extremely narrow, barely sufficient to provide separate identities between the two settlements. A development of this size clearly compromises this as well as the local countryside and open views. Too many settlements in Mid Beds virtually merge - Flitwick and Ampthill, Greenfield/Flitton - often with unattractive and unappealing consequences. Mid Beds Council should guard against this happening.
Roger Highton	This development is inappropriate as it is in the green belt separating Maulden and Ampthill with the loss of agricultural land.
Roy Sinfield	<p>For the District Council to say that it needs provision for between 250 and 500 homes in Ampthill is totally unacceptable. Even if the final figure was at the lower end it would add greatly to the problems already seen as a result the poor road infrastructure serving the town, particularly north to south. One can only guess at the catastrophic consequences should the ultimate development reach the upper figure.</p> <p>The roads in and around Ampthill can't support large additions of housing as the town centre is already regularly choked, particularly at peak times of the day.</p> <p>MBDC's Core Strategy states that no development will be allocated in the Green Belt. It is important that the council maintains this stance as it is essential that we retain the integrity, tradition and character of our Market Towns.</p> <p>The agricultural and green belt land that surrounds Ampthill provides an important buffer between the town and Flitwick, Maulden and other villages.</p>
S M Braybrook	This is green belt land so is by definition entirely unsuitable for any development and contrary to the strategic vision.
S. C. Webb	Leave Ampthill as a village cum town as it is.
S. Dackoch	Current green belt.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
S. Melville	This site would put a great strain on facilities in the town and potentially increase population by a third - also encroach towards Maulden, blurring boundaries.
Sally Davis	Too far from town centre. Site is green belt and should be left alone.
Simon Lewis	The questions above do not allow me to adequately represent my opposition to this proposal, I disagree with it fundamentally. It impinges significantly on the green belt, it erodes the open space between Ampthill and Maulden to the width of one field, development of which would inevitably follow. It would also substantially alter the character of the existing woodlands estate (Ailesbury Road/Wingate Drive) at the north end of the proposed development, as the topography would make the proposed development a dominant feature in the landscape. There is also a nature reserve on this site. Traffic on the minor roads to the north and south of the area would also be increased. Mid Beds have indicated that it contravenes their core strategy, so they should not give this the go-ahead. This development should not be allowed to proceed under any circumstances.
Jane Staples	This land is designated Green Belt and should not be considered for development. It is hoped the District Councils core strategy which states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt" will be adhered.
Steve Kirby	This site is greenbelt and forms the boundary of Ampthill. This boundary is essential to prevent encroachment towards Maulden. Development of this site would be contrary to the core strategy.
Sue Braybrook	This green belt land - so is by definition entirely unsuitable for any development. I see no point in having a core strategic vision which is then ignored.
Sue Hamon Watt	What about MBDC core strategy of not building within Green Belt. Totally inappropriate to build here.
Susan Kirby	This proposal would further erode the green belt and the core strategy. It would also be contrary to the future needs of Ampthill. Green belt should not be eroded and should be left alone. It should not even be included in this, it should be out of the equation.
T. Freeman	Town Centre congestion. Lack of retail outlets. Lack of recreational facilities. Lack of employment - the majority of people work outside the area.
Theresa Jackson	I feel very strongly that green belt land should not be used in any event, the countryside is under severe pressure and we risk spoiling the very essence up of the district through development on rural green belt land, this would also pave the way for future development to grow unchecked.
Valerie Thomas	This is green belt. Green belt means that countryside is kept for our grandchildren to enjoy. It is essential that you keep your policy (core value) of not building on green belt. There is a real danger of becoming urban and not rural. The streets in the centre of Ampthill cannot be widened and is struggling now to cope with the traffic at peak times.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Wood	This is for the most part a prominent site higher than the adjacent existing housing developments and visually would intrude on the landscape in general and in relation to that housing in particular. An acute problem with development in Ampthill is the worsening congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated car parking problems. The inclusion of an eastern relief road for Ampthill within this site would only shift, perhaps, some of the congestion from the southern approach to the town centre to the eastern approach; it would not alleviate that congestion.

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

Submitted by	Comments
L McPheat	We feel strongly that Ampthill should be kept as it is; a quiet Georgian market town. Developing on greenbelt land is a no-no.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Excessive building on open countryside which separates Ampthill from Maulden. Will cause appalling traffic congestion in already busy narrow streets in small market town with buildings of significant historical significance. Will cause problems with schooling as the local schools are already oversubscribed particularly Redborne Upper and Alameda which would be the local schools for this area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H147

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
Alexandra Booth	This site might be suitable for a limited number of dwellings particularly as the site is presently underutilised grassland and it is within the existing boundaries of the village. However its proximity to a County Wildlife Site and SSSI means that any development would have to be carefully controlled to ensure that these sites are not damaged. The nursery is derelict and will become a magnet for vandals if nothing is done with the site so developing it for housing is not a bad idea at all. As with all sites in Maulden any development must be of a size suitable to the character of the village bearing in mind also its limited facilities and lack of public transport.
E M Field	Any development to be sensitive to landscape of Maulden Woods area.
Eleanor Langdon	The potential additional traffic congestion from this site needs to be addressed: maybe the Amphill Road could be blocked off from the A6. The extra strain on the local lower and middle schools would be seriously considered and a station considered.
Michael Brooks	Site should only be developed if Site 149 also proceeds. Surface water to be piped down to the R Flit so as not to overwhelm drains and thus cause flooding. Nearby Maulden Wood means careful attention to potential effects on biodiversity to avoid negative impacts. Bus service along Clophill Road, Maulden: rather spasmodic with lengthy intervals (no service Sundays); better service available from Clophill Green/Flying Horse (about 500m). If either/both sites H149 and H204 considered favourably, there should be comprehensive master plan/brief prepared for all adjacent sites, to be subject to public consultation, to avoid piecemeal development. This approach would maximise infrastructure & community benefits and more easily be able to include affordable housing component. Development should be subject to improvement to junction of Clophill Road, Maulden, with the A6.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Development of this site would not be detrimental to the village landscape If the scale of the development was reduced and built to a scale appropriate to a rural setting, unlike the large three storied town houses built recently on the adjacent site. However a large natural buffer should occur between Maulden Woods and any development.
Mr R A Wells	Taken together these sites would make a complete change to the locality. Even the smallest of the propositions H204 would make an impact beyond its value. The latest development of Trilleyfields of 3 storey is an eyesore and out of keeping with other local development in a forgotten outpost of Maulden

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Anne Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed; make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
B Day & J Day	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and Greensand Ridge and should be protected from development (see H204). Traffic congestion.
Caroline Chapman	Developing this site would cause traffic congestion and take away the countryside element of Maulden. Also the wildlife would be greatly affected. We moved here to get away from a built-up area and enjoy the peace and tranquillity Maulden has to offer and it is lovely to hear horses walking down the road most morning, which would probably stop if there was a lot more traffic.
Celia Gregory	More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area. The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!! In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.
David Hunt	The building of houses in this site would be detrimental to the area which is environmentally friendly with the woods and wildlife of this backwater of Maulden. Hall End is not a village; traffic would be increased on this already dangerous at times, at Clophill Road as it is a rat run from and to the A6. Schools could not cope and Doctors surgery would be full as it is bad enough now to get appointments.
Dr M J A Trudgill	The current road network is already gridlocked and the impact to the countryside will be very significant. The vista from the road up to the woods is an attractive feature in this area and development would be devastating.

Submitted by	Comments
Gerald Gough	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge which is a site of special scientific interest and also a designated county wild life site. When choices about new sites for development need to be made sites such as this must be set aside and prioritised against encroaching development. Any building on this site would be visually obtrusive and would have a major detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Additional traffic from the site will need to access Clophill Road. It will add to the serious traffic congestion that occurs at the A6 junction and Clophill roundabout. Speeding along Clophill Road is a problem for local residents.
J B Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed; make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
Kayleigh Pettit	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Lesley Gough	Congestion, No local amenities, drainage/sewage, size or dwelling, protected wildlife.
M King	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge, a site of SSI. To build on it would help to destroy the rural character of the end of the village, already spoilt by the Trilly Fields development which is not in keeping with the rest of this part of the village. Another 30 houses on this site could potentially add another 60 vehicles feeding on to the A6 and A507.
Melanie Bratt	As a resident in hall end close Maulden, (for 30 years) i remember as a child major flooding problems in the close. We lived at no 5, I live at number 2 now, and we had all the garden under water, due to water running off the fields opposite, where Trilly fields is now built. Flooding still happens, and all my father's vegetables last year were under water and ruined, along with other items. I remember in the past all the residents of hall end out in the pouring rain trying to stop water going into garages and nearly going into houses. I also recollect water cascading past no 5 going down the side of the house and down into the lower part of the garden, which was already under water. I can see this all happening again. And what about the rural aspect and the wildlife of the woods, barking deer come into the field over the road, all this will stop when we have a concrete jungle over there, and in other parts of Maulden.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Blackley	Further development would add to more traffic congestion Clophill Road is already a busy cut-through, both morning and evening for the A6 to A507 to A6. Also would be bad for the environment; very bad for the wildlife.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Adjacent to site of SSSI and would be next to proposed sites numbered H204 and H149 totalling some 80 houses in a very small area just off Clophill Road leading to A6 and A507 which are heavily congested at certain times of the day. Would destroy the rural view of Maulden Woods and potentially wildlife within the area which includes owls, bats and badgers. Potential problems with school places at local schools Redborne and Alameda.
Mr P. J. Patmore	The three blocks of development indicated overleaf are all in an area adjoining a highly scenic area of Maulden Woods on a rising contour. Any impact of development would be most detrimental to the recreational enjoyment of users of Maulden Woods and the adjacent Greens and Ridge Trail. Also H204 is the site of a long dispute over a development on a public footpath. Any development, especially as proposed, would not be acceptable.
Mrs Ann Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Mrs J M Crisp	Should not be considered as close to SSSI.
Mrs Patricia Hunt	Hall End Maulden is only a small off-shoot, a mile from the main village centre. This road could not cope with an increase of traffic to and from the A6. It is already used as a rat run with speeds exceeding the speed limit of 30m.p.h. These fields also act as drainage for water coming from the woods, preventing flooding in heavy rainfalls. This site also next to Maulden woods, a site of special scientific interest and wildlife. Having housing up to these woods would completely spoil its beauty. The local schools could not cope with an influx of more children.
ODell	The site for this proposed housing development is on a slight bend where already in the past many accidents have happened, including police vehicles. To put more vehicles on the road from these houses would jeopardise the safety of the roads inhabitants. Hall End has already had its fair share of development, even though we have no facilities whatsoever.
P. Ccuzon	There is enough traffic using this road,
Paul Coan	Spoil woods and walking on greenslade ridge , good for keeping fit by walking , traffic is bad enough already and power and water supplies already stretched with short power cuts regular event and water supply off has happened too many times to make me happy.
Peter Atterbury	Infrastructure cannot sustain further development. Traffic already congested. Further development would almost definitely cause safety concerns.
Peter Gregory	This site is mainly outside the village envelope and is in the most part agricultural land. Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Amphill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Quentin Cuizzon	I believe the Hall End area of Maulden has already had enough new development already.
R J G Allen	30 houses will be packed like sardines. This will further urbanise a rural area. How can Hall End be described as a large village?
Roger Highton	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at the junctions at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. Only small scale development of 3-4 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.
Susan Galtrey	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at the junctions at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. Only small scale development of 3-4 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H149

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
Alexandra Booth	This is a possible site for suitable development being within the existing boundaries of the village. It is next to a County Wildlife Site and SSSI and steps would need to be taken to ensure these sites are not damaged in any way by the development. If both this development and H147 were allowed it would be a large development in one area which may be inappropriate. Limited facilities in Maulden must be borne in mind including lack of school places and the distance from amenities such as doctor's surgeries and poor public transport.
Mr R A Wells	Taken together these sites would make a complete change to the locality. Even the smallest of the propositions H204 would make an impact beyond its value. The latest development of Trilleyfields of 3 storey is an eyesore and out of keeping with other local development in a forgotten outpost of Maulden

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
Andrew Kitcher	The site is right next door to Maulden Woods and Green Sands Ridge Country Wildlife site and SSSI). We frequently see wildlife from the woods in the field and the views from ours and many other homes nearby are fantastic. Using this site for the building of anything let alone 30+ houses should not be allowed to happen - it will not only spoil the views of many households of the beautiful woods, but will cause further congestion issues to an already overused rat run that is Clophill Road. Hall End already has enough housing - Trilley fields being the latest sizeable development only c.5 years ago. There are many other areas on the Site Allocation plan that would be better suited to development that would have a lesser impact on the area and impact a smaller number of people. Please do not approve.
Anne Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed; make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
B Day & J Day	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge and should be protected from development (see H204). Detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring houses that face the site. Added traffic congestion.

Submitted by	Comments
Caroline Chapman	Developing this site would cause a lot more traffic congestion and noise pollution. We moved from a built-up area to enjoy the countryside that Maulden has to offer. At the moment a lot of traffic speeds down Clophill Road, well above the 30 mph limit (a neighbour recently had their cat killed due to this). The wildlife would also be affected as many species live in the field (H149) proposed for development. Schools in this area are full to capacity, so where would another 100 or so children go to school?
Celia Gregory	<p>More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area.</p> <p>The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!!</p> <p>In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.</p>
David Hunt	Hall End Maulden is not a village only part of Maulden which is life many off shoots, a small backwater. The building of houses here would destroy the natural beauty of Maulden woods. The Clophill Road would be very congested, as it is bad enough now with rat runs to and from the A6. Schools and Doctors surgery could not cope with the intake.
Dr M J A Trudgill	As with the adjacent sites, development on this scale will destroy the local countryside and turn hall end into a dormitory conurbation with no infrastructure. The roads are already grid locked at peak times and land in the area intentionally neglected to encourage development. If we are to retain an attractive rural feel to mid beds- making it a pleasurable place to live we must control this practice.
Eleanor Langdon	I believe this site has a protection order for a particular rare species, perhaps a slow worm. Drainage would have to be addressed, this site being next to another large existing estate, where the land slopes sharply down toward the road. The traffic would increase onto Clophill Road, which may suggest a need for this road to be closed off for access to the A6, in order to reduce the overall volume of traffic. The capacity of the local schools must be considered if this site were to be built on.
Gerald Gough	This site is next to Maulden Woods and the Greensand ridge. At least two animals living in this environment are protected species under the Country and Wildlife Act 1981. Where it is possible to make choices between development sites, sites such as this must take priority and be protected from encroaching development. Any building on this site would be visually obtrusive and would have a major detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Additional traffic from this site will increase the local traffic congestion. This site is not appropriate for supporting local services, nor for providing new local infrastructure. These sites lie in an environmentally sensitive area. It is not appropriate for providing new housing in Mid Bedfordshire.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J B Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed, make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
Kayleigh Pettit	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
M King	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge. A site of SSSI. To build on it would help to destroy the rural atmosphere at this end of the village, already spoilt by the Trilley Fields development which is not in keeping with the village. Another 30 houses could potentially add another 60 cars feeding on to the A6 and A507.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Adjacent to SSSI and proposed sites numbered H204 and H147 which will number 80 + dwellings in total. Will cause excessive traffic using Clophill Road to join congested A6 and A507 and require more spaces at local schools. Disturbance to local wildlife and will ruin view of Maulden Woods.
Mr P. J. Patmore	The three blocks of development indicated overleaf are all in an area adjoining a highly scenic area of Maulden Woods on a rising contour. Any impact of development would be most detrimental to the recreational enjoyment of users of Maulden Woods and the adjacent Greens and Ridge Trail. Also H204 is the site of a long dispute over a development on a public footpath. Any development, especially as proposed, would not be acceptable.
Mrs Ann Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Mrs J M Crisp	Should not be considered as close to SSSI.
Mrs Patricia Hunt	Wall End has been identified as a large village. It is a small backwater of Maulden a mile from the centre of the village. This Clophill Road is already used as a rat run to and from the A6 at speeds in excess of the speed limit. More traffic would create dangerous conditions especially turning out of Hall End Close which even now is very hazardous. Schools in the area could not cope and Drs Surgery is not within easy reach. This site is adjacent to a site of natural beauty and a county wildlife site. To build here would take this away.
P. Ccuzon	There is enough traffic using this road.
Paul Coan	traffic already an issue and development would spoil green land , woods and greensand ridge walking route would be spoilt, plus more houses would add to the power and water problems we get now.
Peter Atterbury	Traffic in this area is already at "congestion" level. Local infrastructure cannot sustain further development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Peter Gregory	This site is mainly outside the village envelope and at present agricultural land. Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Amphill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Quentin Cuizzon	I believe the Hall End area of Maulden has already had enough new development already.
R J G Allen	As with H147 30+ house play area are proposed to be packed into a smaller site. It will further urbanise a rural area. Hall End cannot be reasonably described as a large village.
Roger Highton	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at the junctions at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. Only small scale development of 3-4 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.
Susan Galtrey	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at the junctions at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. Only small scale development of 3-4 houses on Clophill Road should be considered for this site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H172

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

Submitted by	Comments
Nicola Bickerstaff	Maulden has a lower school, post office and a garage that would be supported by residential development at site H172. There are existing facilities within easy travelling distance of site H172 at Maulden. A supermarket is located in Ampthill approximately 1 mile west of site H172. A bank and a post office are also located in Ampthill, on Church Street, less than 1 mile from the site. Site H172 is adjacent to the settlement boundary at the north western edge of Maulden and is considered to be well related to the built form of the settlement. Residential development sympathetic to the character of the village is considered to be appropriate at the site.

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
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Development is too large, particularly as the site is within Green Belt. Smaller scale, ribbon development would be more appropriate up to the line of the housing on the south side of Snow Hill.

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
Alexandra Booth	This area is green belt and should be protected as such. It would represent an extension outwards of Maulden village, something which should be resisted in order to ensure no further spread of the village towards Ampthill. The land is presently used for agriculture and that use should be maintained. Certainly a development of 53 houses is totally inappropriate for the edge of the village. Maulden lacks facilities to support large scale development, including lack of school places. There is almost no public transport either. The council should ensure that it upholds its decision to maintain the designation of this land as green belt. There are far more suitable sites available which are within the existing boundaries of Maulden or other parishes and which would involve development on under-utilised land rather than agricultural land.
Andrew Sharpe	Green belt.
E M Field	Development in Green Belt not acceptable
Laura Johnston	This is greenbelt land and so should not ever be considered if we are going to preserve countryside for future generation to enjoy.
Michael Brooks	Development at this site would be contrary to Green Belt policy and would erode the separation between Ampthill and Maulden. If it were decided to permit development here, it should be limited to a single row of houses fronting Snow Hill with generous landscaping to the rear in order to soften the hard urban edge. No in-depth development should be considered.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Gretel Nevols	This site is outside the Settlement Envelope and on Green Belt land designed to compliment the gap between the town of Ampthill and the village of Maulden. To build here would open the way to more development in the area which will finally close this gap and sound the death knell for the village of Maulden. We will be swallowed up and disappear into the town of Ampthill. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? The Lower and Middle Schools in Ampthill stand adjacent on the same site & your information regarding times to reach the middle school are sadly inaccurate, also to the south of this site the bus runs once an hour if you are lucky and neither of the schools stand on a bus route in Ampthill so your times there are rather optimistic. Children from this site would not qualify to travel on the school bus so would have to walk through open countryside to reach the middle school. Both Middle & Lower schools in Ampthill & Maulden are full to capacity.
Mrs J M Crisp	Far too big a development, also on green belt which must be protected at all costs.
Nigel Pollard	As per H122, I would be concerned about any proposal which would threaten the distinct characters and entities of Ampthill and Maulden.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H173

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

Submitted by	Comments
Nicola Bickerstaff	Maulden has a lower school, post office and a garage that would be supported by residential development at site H173. There are existing facilities within easy travelling distance of site H173 at Maulden. A supermarket is located in Ampthill approximately 1 mile west of site H173. A bank and a post office are also located in Ampthill, on Church Street, less than 1 mile from the site. Site H173 is adjacent to the settlement boundary at the north western edge of Maulden and is considered to be well related to the built form of the settlement. Residential development sympathetic to the character of the village is considered to be appropriate at the site.

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
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Development within Green Belt should not be permitted under any circumstances and any development which may occur on this site will cause considerable congestion within the already confined access road. A small scale development may be applicable.

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
Alexandra Booth	This is a green belt site. It would represent development beyond the existing boundaries of the village and as such should not be allowed. The council should ensure that it upholds its decision to maintain the designation of this land as greenbelt and to prevent the further spread outwards of Maulden. This land is presently used for agriculture and that usage should be maintained.
Andrew Sharpe	Green belt.
C Burgess	We feel that this site would not be appropriate as it is too close to the greensands ridge taking away much needed countryside and would not support or be near to local services, the site would cause traffic problems for residents and there would be a cause for concern about safety of children who currently play happily in local park and can safely cross to go there.
E M Field	Not acceptable in Green Belt.
Kelly Hart	This land is green belt so the effect on the countryside would be affected not just by the houses but the extra traffic and noise. The access is proposed off Kings Road which would bring the extra traffic past two of the entrances to the playing field where children go. Lots of children cross the road to access the playground more traffic on what's already a small busy housing estate road could be very dangerous.
M. L. Carter	This is green belt and should not be sacrificed to building The access road, Kings Road, is off The Brache which is already congested with excessive traffic for its size.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	Development at this site would be contrary to Green Belt policy and would erode the separation between Ampthill and Maulden.
Mr R Hart	This proposed site for housing would have a MAJOR impact on the countryside. The access proposed for any further housing is totally unsuitable, and there are already traffic problems with the existing housing in this area. Any further development would be detrimental and dangerous to the occupants of Wingfield Avenue, Kings Road and the Brache. I strongly oppose the suggestion of development in this area. There are by far more suitable areas within Maulden for extra housing.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	This site is outside the Settlement Envelope on Green Belt land designed to compliment the gap between the town of Ampthill and the village of Maulden. To build here would open the way to more development which will finally close this gap and sound the death knell for the village of Maulden. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? Your information regarding time to reach the middle school in Ampthill is sadly inaccurate, also to the south of this site on Ampthill Road the bus runs only once an hour and neither of the schools stand on a bus route in Ampthill so your times there are rather optimistic. Children from this site would not qualify to travel on the school bus so would have to walk through open countryside to reach the middle school. Both Middle & Lower schools in Ampthill & Maulden are full to capacity. Exit from Kings Road is onto The Brache a very busy but narrow road used as a rat run to the A6, made worse by parked cars at this point.
Mrs J R Rose	This is green belt land which I understood would never be built on. There are very few amenities to support more people in Maulden including no doctors, dental, or veterinary surgeries. The bus service is very poor since the majority of our buses have been cut which also means limited access to train station in Flitwick - the morning bus service that is provided (slightly larger than the flitabus) is not enough to allow for the amount of passengers travelling to Bedford that use it at the present time.
Mrs J M Crisp	Site is in green belt so should not even be considered.
Mrs Spreadborough	I have lived in Kings Rd (at the top) for just about 30 years, to put a development here is totally out of the question, we get enough congestion in Kings rd and also trying to get onto the Brache. Adding another housing estate here would undoubtedly cause more problems which we could all do without.

Submitted by	Comments
Nicky Reese	<p>Kings Road currently is the only road off this "estate" in Maulden - it currently is used by all the residents of Wingfield Avenue, Becketts Close and Kings Road. It is not only used by traffic, but also by all the parents and children walking to the Lower School and the recreation ground. This constitutes a large number of pedestrians, cars and motorbikes all currently using Kings Road to get to and from their housing. Kings Road is fairly narrow in parts and already is the only place for many of the residents to park. I would be seriously concerned if 42 further houses were built at the end of Kings Road, as not only would it increase the traffic by a probable 42+ vehicles, but it would seriously compromise the safety of the many young children who live around this area. Most of the housing around here contains old people or families with young children, many of whom are out playing in the streets on bikes and skateboards most weekends and evenings. Kings Road also contains the only two entrances for the recreational area for the whole estate and a lot of the children go over to the playground unsupervised by their parents on a daily basis once the weather is good. To add such a huge number of houses/additional traffic to a road that does not provide a direct route to a major road through Maulden, especially as this road is used so heavily by the local children, seems to me to be dangerous and against the best interests of the many residents here. Many of the other sites that you have highlighted in Maulden feed directly onto a major road through Maulden and this has to be a much safer option for the local residents.</p>
Peter Gregory	<p>Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.</p>
Richard Adams	<p>Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development.</p>
Simon	<p>This site will be on Green Belt Land and very close to the Green Sand Ridge which would be seriously undermined having a significant impact on the local countryside. It would have a serious impact on local traffic this village has enough traffic passing through without adding to it. Our Local school can not expand without losing its popularity for being one of the best lower schools in the area. Public transport in the village has been reduced which would force any new residents into car use. The Council said they would not give in to developers so why start now. Existing Residents do not want any development and would strongly oppose this site and others in this village.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H178**

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
E M Field	Traffic hazard at junction between Silsoe Road and Clophill Road needs consideration.
Jill Mather	Site is suitable for infill housing development - different sizes of dwellings - but only if permission is contingent on improvement of local services and infrastructure - Maulden Lower School is close by, for instance, but it is full.

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
Alexandra Booth	This site is within the existing boundaries of Maulden and may be suitable for a small amount of development, although it would mean the loss of agricultural land. The low density proposals are good as they are in keeping with the surrounding residential area. The limited facilities in Maulden must however be considered when deciding whether to allow any significant development in the village. The character of Maulden as a village must be maintained.
David Marsh	Maulden can best support small scale development as long as there is the correct infrastructure to support it. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is treacherous with vehicles emerging from Silsoe Rd and vehicles speeding down Clophill. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. Therefore I would support small developments of 4/5 bed homes to bring wealth to the village. I do not support any housing with minimal outside space. This is a rural village - all new houses should have decent gardens. The countryside should be respected.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	A very small scale development would be more appropriate in this location and to a scale complimenting the adjacent cottages.
Sally Marsh	This is the type of site that Maulden can best support i.e. small scale given the correct infrastructure to support it. The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. Therefore the actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. I would support small developments of 4/5 bed homes to bring wealth to the village. I can't support any housing with minimal outside space. This is a rural village - all new houses should have decent gardens. All hedging should be maintained. 4 Village children did not get into Maulden Lower last September. This situation cannot be made worse by more housing. Local children should be able to go to their local school from a emotional and environmental point of view. I would like to be consulted on what criteria will be used to decide which sites to approve.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs E Smith	The existing infrastructure makes any development outside the village envelope unsustainable and undesirable in what is a rural area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H193

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
Alexandra Booth	The development of this site is likely to present a suitable opportunity for a mixed use development. It is within the existing boundaries of the village and the existing use of the site is already light industrial. The existing employment opportunities will be maintained including the timber yard and lorry park and agriculture but with the addition of a number of dwellings which would not impact badly on the surrounding area.
C R Jackson	Shops - supermarket to supply Maulden, Clophill, Silsoe. Access A507 slip road.
Simon Jackson	Shops - supermarket to serve Maulden, Clophill, Silsoe etc. Access onto slip road A507 no major road works needed.

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
Michael Brooks	The new link road between Clophill Road and the A507 (with or without development at site H051) represents a hard boundary between Hall End and open countryside. Development of site H193 would breach this and cause Hall End to sprawl westwards. There may be a case for additional single dwelling and/or barn conversions at Water End or Mill Farms. The SE corner of the site is in the flood plain. If any development were permitted here at all, it should be limited to one or two dwellings fronting the road at the NE corner of the site. Bus service past the site is spasmodic. Distance to nearest local services (shop/PO, pubs, principal bus services) is 700m at Clophill Green. Any development at this site should restore the footpath south from Water End Fm to the A507.
R V G Allen	Taken together with H051 this would compromise the rural appearance of "The Cut" and this part of Clophill Rd. Hall End cannot reasonably be described as a large village.

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
B Day & J Day	Adjacent to a listed building. Traffic congestion.

Submitted by	Comments
Celia Gregory	<p>More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area.</p> <p>The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!!</p> <p>In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.</p>
Dr M J A Trudgill	<p>Access to this area is restrictive and the road network is unable to support the current levels of traffic. The replacement of the current active wood yard and agricultural vehicle storage with housing begs the question: Where will they relocate to?</p>
Dr T and Mrs I Willcocks	<p>Mixed use Survey: Site Ref: H193 (East End of WE)</p> <p>This site is not suited to commercial development because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is remote from Maulden Village, its services and social infrastructure. 2) There are plenty of available commercial units nearby (e.g. Wrest Park). 3) The land is agricultural with some rural timber yard activity. 4) It is in the flood plain catchment area of the River Flit. 5) The very narrow Water End road is not suited to increased traffic.
E M Field	<p>This is actually close to the historic hamlet of Water End and would irretrievably alter its landscape and nature.</p>
G A Thorp	<p>Even if access to/from site is limited to Clophill Road, I'm sure that drivers would use Water End as a rat run when the Ampthill bypass congested. Would increase congestion and increase hazard of Ampthill bypass. Water End is a single track road used for horse riders, runners (joggers), walkers and cyclists. There are already some businesses on Water End giving increased traffic.</p>
Gerald Gough	<p>This site is adjacent to a listed building. Development of the site would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. Development of this site would also add to traffic congestion on the Clophill Road and A507. the Clophill Road in hall End is a very busy cut-through in the mornings and seeding traffic is a problem for local residents</p>
Ian Hilsdon	<p>Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.</p>
John Stidworthy	<p>This site is a Brownfield Site and is currently used as a timber yard and the owner lives in the farm house. It is in an area which would not be suitable for development of employment, lorry park and more houses as it is currently near to Maulden Woods and a rural environment. It would be very noticeable if it was to be developed i.e. it would not blend with the landscape and would in fact create a lot of noise and disturbance to the surrounding environment.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Joy Trudgill	The details of this proposal are sketchy and development of this area will have very significant impact. The countryside, access and traffic are of greatest concern.
Kayleigh Pettit	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Lesley Gough	Congestion, no local amenities, drainage/sewage, size or dwelling, protected wildlife.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	<p>Similar comments to Application No.H051 insofar as this development would be lower than the surrounding roads, on the flood plain. Any development would contradict the construction of the A507 and the link road, as the purpose of this was to move traffic away from the village. The noise and pollution levels would be totally untenable and any access to the site would be extremely dangerous, either onto the A507 or the link road. Both these roads are experiencing increased traffic movements, with traffic jams at peak times on the A507, and this will only add to that situation.</p> <p>An alternative suggestion would be ribbon development along Clophill Road west of No.136 which would then produce a village scene appropriate to the rural location. This is more relevant as there are three Listed buildings adjacent to the site which would be contrary to their rural location. Similar comments apply to the suggestion of employment/retail development.</p>
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Land opposite grade 11 listed Ivy Farmhouse and adjacent to ancient cottage both visually beautiful. It would destroy open farmland and the view thereof which is the attraction of Hall End, Maulden. 20+ dwellings excessive in this area of the village. Would be in a flood zone - the area is quite damp and has the River Flitt nearby- possibly drainage/flooding implications. Traffic congestion will be caused to both Clophill Road and Water End Road. Water End Road being particularly narrow and picturesque. Resultant congestion exasperated on A507.
Mr R A Wells	This is a large area which completes the immediate locality from rural to semi urban. Any retail development (visions of warehouse type modern retailing with the universal character of national) chains would be appalling. Industrial use would probably be only lorry storage and vehicle repair.
Mr R Hough	Most of this land is on floodplain, development upon which is contrary to current government policy. A development of this size would put significant strain on existing local infrastructure. Serious concern should be raised on the nature of any industrial use in changing an area of natural beauty but also to the increased traffic that would result in an area where there are no pavements, unlit roads and single track roads. This should not be considered as suitable for mixed use.
Mr S Fowler & Mrs M Fenton	If the land to be developed is that part of the site directly opposite Ivy Farm it would materially affect the setting of a Grade II listed property. Local roads cannot safely sustain any more heavy goods vehicles. We are already concerned at the impact of existing heavy goods vehicle movement in the vicinity on our own timber frame listed property (vibration damage). Dangerous traffic location, inadequate to support additional traffic. Adjacent to listed building. Inaccurate submission, vast majority of land site is in current agricultural use (pig farming + paddocks).

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Ann Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
Mrs J M Crisp	This would have significant impact on traffic using water end, a single track road.
Mrs S. M Ridgeway	By- pass is already extremely busy and I am of the opinion that more vehicles- both commercial and private would make this road become even more dangerous. Also Clophill Road is "well-used" and when cars are parked near the school at beginning and end of school hours. This is part of Maulden is also a potential danger spot which would be made worse by any increase in traffic.
P. Ccuzon	Will generate far too much extra traffic to the detriment of the many children in the area.
Paul Coan	Traffic already a problem plus would add to power and water supply problems as they can just about cope now.
Quentin Cuizzon	Will generate far too much extra traffic to the detriment of the children in the area.
Roger Highton	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as a large part of the site is defined as at risk of flooding by The Environment Agency, is outside the village boundary and would result in the loss of agricultural land used for cattle and pigs for many years. No further development should be considered for this site.
Susan Galtrey	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as part of the site is defined as at risk of flooding by The Environment Agency, it is outside the village boundary and would result in the loss of agricultural land used for cattle, pigs and horses for many years. No further development should be considered for this site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
M King	This site would add to the congestion which already exists at the junctions with the A6 and A507. I understood that this site was turned down for a new place headquarters because of the added traffic problems it could cause.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H204

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
Alexandra Booth	This site is presently a disused nursery which is falling into disrepair. It therefore seems a sensible site for development for housing being disused and also being within the existing boundaries of Maulden and not leading to extension of the village. Plainly the issue of rights of way over the site needs to be addressed in terms of whether these rights of way can be preserved in any development. 18 dwellings is an acceptable number for Maulden, which is a village and where therefore large developments should be resisted.
Keith Miller Ariba Archtect	There currently is a dispute considering a pedestrian walk way on the land owned by Mr A Boweus. The housing layout and road pattern provides pedestrian and vehicle access so the footpath and forest as the rear of the site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
E M Field	Demolishing existing house could give the area unacceptably dense development for a village setting.
Eleanor Langdon	Provision must be made for the extra traffic congestion onto Clophill Road. The potential extra strain on local schools must be accounted for.
Michael Brooks	Site should only be developed if Sites 147 and 149 also proceed. 129 Clophill Rd should not be demolished: take access from adjacent site instead. Surface water to be piped down to the R Flit so as not to overwhelm drains and thus cause flooding. Nearby Maulden Wood means careful attention needed to potential effects on biodiversity to avoid negative impacts. Bus service along Clophill Road, Maulden is rather spasmodic with lengthy intervals (no service Sundays); a better service is available from Clophill Green/Flying Horse (over 500m). If either/both sites 147 and 149 considered favourably, there should be comprehensive master plan/brief prepared for all adjacent sites, to be subject to public consultation, to avoid piecemeal development. This approach would maximise infrastructure & community benefits and more easily be able to include affordable housing component. Development should be subject to improvement to junction of Clophill Road, Maulden, with the A6.
Mr R A Wells	Taken together these sites would make a complete change to the locality. Even the smallest of the propositions H204 would make an impact beyond its value. The latest development of Trilleyfields of 3 storey is an eyesore and out of keeping with other local development in a forgotten outpost of Maulden

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Anne Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed, make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
B Day & J Day	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and Greensand Ridge (a designated country wildlife site and an area of great landscape value) This site should therefore be protected from development house no. 123b has been built across an existing footpath, blocking right of way and house of 129 would need to be demolished to provide access.
Caroline Chapman	This area is a wildlife haven, with many species of birds, bats (which are protected) etc. and almost part of Maulden woods with a bridal way and walk used by many dog walkers and hikers. We moved from a built-up area to enjoy these surroundings which Maulden has to offer. Many of the surrounding fields are used for animals, which is lovely for the local children to see. Developing this area would cause traffic congestion, and more vehicles speeding (many already exceed the 30mph down Clophill Road). Schools are full to capacity, so where would another 100 or so children go to school.
Celia Gregory	More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area. The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!! In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.
David Hunt	The building of houses on this site would create yet more traffic onto this Clophill Road Hall End a quiet back water of Maulden. This road is heavily used already by speeding traffic. Also the area is of natural beauty. Building would spoil this also. Schools could not take the extra intake and doctors surgery in Ampthill would be to overflowing.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Dr M J A Trudgill	Traffic congestion in this area during peak times is already a significant problem. The recent development further to the East greatly contributed to this. The impact on the countryside would be appalling and the ribbon development nature of hall end destroyed in favour of a large dormitory conurbation with no infrastructure.
Ian Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
JB Whitehorn	1) According to BBC news the world will face a huge food shortage in 20 years time. To build along Greensand Ridge, highly prices farmland, when the effects of global warming are so near would appear very short sighted. 2) The hill from Maulden Woods drains through my land and provides moisture in summer to what is very light sandy soil. When my footings were excavated some 25 years ago we were surprised at the amount of quicksand. Should this source dry up because of concrete drains, I can foresee my neighbours and I having structural problems in long dry periods. 3) The A6 and A507 around this area are notorious for driving deaths, traffic jams morning and night to Luton and Bedford even before the new villages (Wixams) are developed, make journey times to place of work unacceptable. Developments in this area would only add to this problem.
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
Lesley Gough	Congestion, no local amenities, drainage/sewage, size or dwelling, protected wildlife
M King	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge a site of SSSI. To build on it would help to destroy the rural atmosphere of this end of the village already spoilt by the Trilley Fields development which is not in keeping with the rest of this part of the village.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	This site is adjacent to Maulden Woods and the Greensand Ridge (a designated country wildlife site, site of special scientific interest and area of great landscape value). This site should therefore be protected from any development. In addition to this the access point onto the Clophill Road will be very close to the A507 link road which would add to the traffic congestion and potential safety hazard.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Adjacent to SSSI and proposed sites H147 and is comprising some 80+ dwellings in total. Out of character for area and would spoil natural view of woodland at Maulden Woods. Traffic congestion to Clophill Road and resultant congestion to already heavily used A6 and A507. Probable overcrowding at local schools which are already heavily subscribed. Demolition of perfectly adequate house to enable construction and access to the site totally unacceptable in view of location by SSSI. Disruption to public right of way to Maulden Woods possible.
Mr P. J. Patmore	The three blocks of development indicated overleaf are all in an area adjoining a highly scenic area of Maulden Woods on a rising contour. Any impact of development would be most detrimental to the recreational enjoyment of users of Maulden Woods and the adjacent Greens and Ridge Trail. Also H204 is the site of a long dispute over a development on a public footpath. Any development, especially as proposed, would not be acceptable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr S Fowler & Mrs M Fenton	We are concerned at the impact on the setting of our Grade II listed property which directly abuts part of the proposed site and at the visual impact of such a development immediately adjacent to the Greensand Ridgeway (Maulden Woods) which the Council is committed to protecting. The 1797 Enclosure Map at the Bedford Records Office suggest this site is of historical significance (large building possibly a former Manor house on the site).
Mr S Fowler + Mrs M Fenton	Adjacent to greensand ridge county wildlife site and site of special scientific interest which council is obliged to protect. Adjacent to curtilage of grade II listed property which council is obliged to protect.
Mrs Ann Hilsdon	Not viable - due to lack of facilities already - unsustainable. Traffic congestion already with using Clophill Road as a "rat run". Close vicinity to Maulden Woods - a place of special scientific interest building will ruin area.
ODell	Hall End is a small community with no facilities such as shops etc. Schools, policing, traffic etc. cannot support the amount of housing suggested for this small area. The road between the link road to the bypass and the A6 is already a very busy one with many drivers using it as a fast short cut; more entrances onto the road will only increase the dangers on this small length of road. Hall End is not able to support more housing.
Paul Coan	site would spoil the wonderful Maulden Woods and Greensand ridge loved by walkers which helps us keep fit , we have already had development cause problems , traffic is an issue now so would get worse plus the area water and power supplies can just about cope now , with major loss of water supplies over the recent period as has been regular short to long loss of power supply.
Peter Atterbury	Existing traffic congestion. Poor existing local infrastructure.
Peter Gregory	This site is mainly outside the village envelope. It is presently used for agricultural purposes and in my opinion should stay as such. It immediately adjoins the Maulden Woods and any development here would drastically spoil the fine balance between the existing ribbon development along Clophill road and these woods. Maulden is already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Quentin Cuizzon	I believe the Hall End area of Maulden has already had enough new development already.
R J G Allen	This will further urbanise a rural area, being on rising ground will enhance the effect. Hall End cannot be reasonably described as a large village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roger Highton	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. It also covers a public footpath which has been blocked since 123b Clophill Road was built across the path. Only small scale development on area already occupied by greenhouses should be considered for this site.
Susan Galtrey	Hall End, Maulden is a small rural community that has gradually grown over the last 40 years. No facilities are available in Hall End, with choice of 1.5 mile walk to Maulden for lower school, playgroup, village hall, shops, pubs, church etc. Some facilities are available in Clophill but this requires crossing A6 with 60mph speed limit which is unsafe for children and elderly. Increase in traffic will risk further accidents at either end of the link road between Clophill Road and bypass. This development is inappropriate as it is developing agricultural land between Clophill Road and Maulden Woods an Area of Special Scientific Interest. It also covers a public footpath which has been blocked since 123b Clophill Road was built across the path. Only small scale development on area already occupied by greenhouses should be considered for this site.
Zoe Gough	I do not think that building houses on this site is appropriate.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H218

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
Alexandra Booth	The opportunity to remove a commercial use from a predominantly residential area means that this site should seriously be considered for development. 60 dwellings seems like too large a development however. Maulden is a village and its character needs to be preserved as such. It does not have the facilities to support further large scale development having already had a large development built recently behind the White Hart public house.
Andrew Sharpe	Limited development would be ok.
Warmingtons	Maulden has been identified as a large village, and therefore one in which further development should be considered. The site is located close to the village centre and has the advantage that it would remove the existing commercial and transport usage from Moor Lane, providing a benefit to the immediate community. The site is capable of providing a mixture of terraced and semi-detached housing, thus providing lower cost properties suitable for those joining the property ladder for the first time. The site forms a natural rounding off of the village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Margaret Mozley	A small number of houses might be better than a large development
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Whilst it would be an improvement to remove the commercial activity, the increase in traffic movements may produce an intolerable level to the existing residents, coupled with a dangerous access point onto Amphill Road. A smaller scale development may be more appropriate on the existing commercial site only. Should the commercial site be removed, where is it going to be re-sited, therefore maintaining employment levels in the area.

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
E M Field	Would encroach on Maulden Moor, historic market gardening landscape of low-key but genuine interest and value.
Jane Blindell	Maulden school is already oversubscribed! Where is the provision for all the children coming into the village? This site has already made the main road by the coop dangerous on the brow of a hill with parked cars! More houses on this site would spoil the nearby footpaths and views. The main concern for any development in Maulden must be that the school is already turning away children, will extra money be made available for the school to expand?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Laura Johnson	This would totally spoil the countryside around Moor Lane. Moor Lane is used by several hundred people from the village who enjoy the peace and beauty of this so far unspoilt part of the village. Also to lose the commercial site would be a disadvantage.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Settlement Envelope for this area apart from a very small section. Maulden School is very small and full to capacity with no room to expand. There is no public transport running down Moor Lane so your estimate of 13.55 mins by public transport to reach the GP Surgery in Ampthill (which also does not stand on a public transport route) is optimistic to say the least. The site abuts Gardeners Close which has taken 20 years to gain planning permission due to massive opposition from residents in this area despite the fact that it is wholly within the Settlement Envelope. Building here will invite potential plans to build on the adjacent plot to the east,(also outside the settlement envelope) which will completely box in the rear of the houses in Ampthill Road whose occupants have enjoyed views across open countryside for decades. This will affect us personally as we purchased our house specifically to be on the outside edge of the village.
Mrs J M Crisp	This area has already been substantially developed recently and does not require any more.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development. The A6/A507 roundabout/junction would need significant upgrading to cope with all the extra traffic this development would create.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H221

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

Submitted by	Comments
Warmingtons	Past development within Maulden has tended to concentrate on executive properties. There is a general need for housing of lower value properties such as terraced and semi-detached housing to meet local needs, and this site would provide a suitable location. If sufficient of the site is identified then funds would be available to relocate the existing non-conforming use of the transport depot, leading to removal of the existing lorry movements and improvements of traffic flow within Limbersey Lane. The site is located close to the centre of the village and thus is of a sustainable nature.

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
Andrew Sharpe	Real problem with access if large development. Small scale only.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Development considered far too large and would have a considerable impact on the village in terms of access into the village via the very narrow Brache/Limbersey Lane. A much smaller development should be considered.

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
E M Field	Proposed development is very inappropriate for this area of strong landscape value around Greensand Ridge. Dangerous bends on Limbersey Lane cause traffic hazard.
Jane Edwards	The centre of the village is already congested. Any building proposal in the centre is utter madness. If you have to build somewhere in the village use the brown sites within the village that are derelict and need renovation. The village is already big enough. The parking at the village shop, school and post office are already causing difficulties with traffic congestion. Since the new development has arrived behind the co-op it is noticeable that the traffic volume has gone up. We are a village not a town!! Town houses are not appropriate for villages. It seems the thinking behind these schemes has not been thought through! Where is the environmental advantage in squeezing in more housing into a village that is already overcrowded! The only advantage is with the developer and his profit. Whatever happened to the theory that green fields should not be built on, or are we becoming an urban sprawl, soon to join to Ampthill and Flitwick!
Laura Jonston	This site is next to Greens and Ridgeway public long distance footpath and on unspoilt countryside. Access from Limbersey Lane would be tricky and dangerous because of the narrow and busy country road.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
M. L. Carter	This development would extend the village into what is predominantly green fields with a long distance footpath in close proximity, and would increase inappropriately and dangerously additional traffic on to the inadequate roads of Limbersey Lane and The Brache.
Mr A Carter	Limbersey Lane is not at all suitable for handling the extra traffic generated by this development. This is very picturesque countryside adjusting the green Ridge path, the countryside would of course be destroyed by this development.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Land is open farmland with views over wide area of natural beauty. 100+ dwellings out of character for the area and would cause enormous problems with traffic to the Brache and Limbersey Lane which are both narrow. Also close to Greensand Ridge Walk an area of beauty and county significance.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Settlement Envelope for this area. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? Maulden School is very small and full to capacity with no room to expand. There is no public transport running down Limbersey Lane so your estimate of 16.08 mins by public transport (a bus that runs once an hour) to reach the GP Surgery in Ampthill (which also does not stand on a public transport route) is optimistic to say the least. Access to this site could only be via Limbersey Lane which is a very narrow lane liable to flood in the dip every rainfall, with limited line of sight in both directions.
Mrs J M Crisp	Far too big a development for a small village such as Maulden. Maulden has limited facilities. Would create a big traffic increase.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development. Limbersey Lane is too narrow to cope with the additional traffic this sort of development would generate.
Richard Penwright	Village infrastructure would not be able to cope with this many dwellings.
Sarah Clough	Limbersey Lane is a rural road that struggles with the existing traffic to a few homes. Traffic to this area would be greatly increased. This and is adjacent to the Greensand ridge walk and I feel should be left as a rural area.
Simon Clough	Infrastructure on Limbersey Lane cannot cope currently, so additional housing numbers on this scale would be foolhardy.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H225**

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

Submitted by	Comments
G. Grogan	This site has the potential to be a positive addition to the local area as long as it is developed in a manner in harmony with the landscape.

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
Andrew Sharpe	Only objection is building on flood zone and some disruption to wildlife.

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
Charles J.Marshall	This development will have problems of access either directly on to A507 or water end which is a single lane road and has a large amount of traffic already. There are a lot of young families living in the lane and any increase in traffic would put school children using it under a great deal of risk.
Christine Randall	The access roads are poor and would create further danger for children using the roads to the local schools. The land is low lying and housing would prevent some natural water drainage increasing flood risk to existing homes.
Dr T and Mrs I Willcocks	This site is NOT suited to housing development because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is directly adjacent to the busy and dangerous A507 highway. 2. It is remote from Maulden village, its services and social infrastructure. 3. It is located in a greenbelt rural area which is a valuable finite resource. 4. It is in the flood plain catchment area of the River Flit. 5. The site lacks water, sewage and energy infrastructure.
E M Field	New detached houses very unsuitable for the hamlet of Water End, and site beside A507 unsuitable for residential development.
G A Thorp	Access from Ampthill bypass would add a traffic hazard and increase congestion.
Jill Mather	More large residential dwellings are not required in Maulden.
John Stidworthy	The site is not accessible by road and is currently at the end of a fishery where people come for recreation. Totally unsuitable for development.
M J Coombes	I don't know where "A50" is but Water End Road is completely unsuitable for further development. The road is a single track lane and cannot be widened due to the position of existing buildings. This makes the prospect of traffic increase unacceptably dangerous. Any development in the Maulden/Clophill area will only add to the already heavy congestion suffered at the Clophill A6/A507 roundabout on a daily basis.

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	This is an isolated site well away from the village and local services. Water End is a scattered hamlet unsuitable for further development, with the possible exception of a single infill dwelling in a gap in the frontage on Water End lane itself. Water End is a very narrow single-track lane and further traffic should be discouraged. There is no public transport anywhere near the site. Development here would be an intrusion into open countryside. The site should be rejected.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	The only available access would be onto the A507 which would be completely unacceptable and very dangerous. The object of a village by pass (the A507) is to remove traffic from the village situation, not to permit increase in housing along its route.
Mr R Hough	Water end is an unspoilt rural settlement with a single track road. The road is very narrow with no pavement and few passing places making it already difficult for pedestrian and traffic movement. Several young children live in the road, which has two blind corners. Any development that adds to traffic in the road would be extremely dangerous.
Mrs J M Crisp	This is a silly proposal, with the plot of land being adjacent to a busy main road, and access would need to be off that road. Totally unnecessary to build only 4 houses here.

Ref Number: H230

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
Frazer Hickling	<p>Ref; FH/JMS/032936 2nd April 2008 COMMENTS.</p> <p>A full and comprehensive representation was submitted during the Council's call for sites in 2007. However, in response to this consultation, we would wish to add the following comments.</p> <p>Firstly, we believe that it may have been useful and informative to include the site's current status in the brief synopsis for each site on the web site. The current status of all the sites is not easily accessible, unless you read all the supporting information. Given that the target audience is the general public, this relevant information should have been made accessible by a simple addition to the synopsis.</p> <p>One of the greatest benefits to developing Longview Farm is that the site is already developed and in an intensive agricultural use, with a number of agricultural barns and hard surface areas. However, the consultation includes a number of Greenfield proposals and yet this site, along with other previously developed sites, is not distinguishable from the Greenfield sites in the consultation documents. Whilst it is clear the Council will favour those sites more spatially contained on the edge of the larger settlement, the significant environmental benefits of reusing highly developed agricultural sites cannot be ignored. Despite the agricultural sites cannot be ignored. Despite the agricultural use falling outside the PPS3 definition of previously used land, the site at Longview Farm has a distinctly 'Brownfield' appearance and character. The use of the site as a piggery is more akin to a commercial operation than the traditional farming operations. It is therefore suggests that such traits should raise the site's profile above those 'greenfield' sites identified about the village.</p> <p>Finally, in respect of the constraints, the Council has identified the western boundary as partly within the flood zones 2 and 3. For clarification, the Environment Agency's maps show the flood zone clipping the very western corner of the site, however the maps show the flood zone clipping the very western corner of the site, however, the inaccuracies of these maps are well documented and given the flow and direction of the stream and localised topography, we cannot foresee the flood plain being a constraint on development. If allocated, the application would be supported by an FRA and drainage proposals incorporating sustainable drainage methods. In summary, Longview Farmhouse offers a great opportunity to provide new housing whilst using a Brownfield site and significantly improving the character and appearance of the open countryside. The site's mature landscape setting creates an enclosed backdrop for development. The site is in a good location close to Maulden, with access to local services and facilities, and its development will contribute toward affordable housing stocks, the local school and bringing forward the proposed cycle route. We trust our comments will be given due consideration.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jill Mather	Site could be developed with mixed sizes of dwellings - but only if permission was contingent on improvements to local services and infrastructure - which are certainly not adequate at present.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	This development would improve the environment for the adjacent residents but how, by removal of the commercial enterprise, assist increasing employment in the area? Should consider lower density development to allow residents to feel they are in a rural setting. There is a potential increase in traffic volume creating further congestion which exists today at the junction with Silsoe Road and Ampthill Road by the School, with poor visibility.

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
David Marsh	The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. This is a rural village - there is no need to load the housing requirement for mid Beds onto Maulden with this size of development. This position would be better used for open space for Maulden. 4 Village children did not get into Maulden Lower last September. This situation cannot be made worse by more housing. Local children should be able to go to their local school from an emotional and environmental point of view.
E M Field	This is outside the current village boundary of housing and impinges on the Flit valley landscape and hamlet of Water End.
Gail Hobday	I think the number of houses proposed for this site is too great and would create a dense area of housing in this rural area.
Kevin Powis	I think that this site with 150 potential houses is for a) the site b) Maulden. I also think that it will dramatically make more traffic on Silsoe Road and through Maulden. The junction onto Clophill Road from Silsoe Road will not cope and is dangerous particularly at school times. The school is already full, so where will the children go to school.
Mrs E Smith	The infrastructure makes any development of this substantially rural area out of the question.
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Settlement Envelope for this area. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? Maulden School is very small and full to capacity with no room to expand. There is little public transport, none down Silsoe Road, only a bus once an hour on Ampthill Road in peak times and longer intervals throughout the day so your estimate of 24.51 minutes by public transport to reach the GP Surgery in Ampthill (which also does not stand on a public transport route) is optimistic to say the least. The new buildings at the northern end of Silsoe Road have created a blind exit onto Ampthill Road/Clophill Road crossroads which is a potential Road Safety Hazard at the crossroads on which the school stands.
Mrs J M Crisp	This is quite a large development for a reasonably quiet road. It would create increased traffic problems, and is also using green fields.

Submitted by	Comments
Sally Marsh	The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. This is a rural village - there is no need to load the housing requirement for mid Beds onto Maulden with this size of development. This position would be better used for open space for Maulden. 4 Village children did not get into Maulden Lower last September. This situation cannot be made worse by more housing. Local children should be able to go to their local school from a emotional and environmental point of view. I would like to be consulted on what criteria will be used to decide which sites to approve.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H233**

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
Eleanor Langdon	The impact on traffic congestion must be carefully considered here. The strain on the capacity of local schools, especially Maulden Lower, must be adequately compensated for.
Mr & Mrs R Sabey	Present infrastructure cannot cope, which includes sewerage and water supply and surface water drainage.

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
Andrew Sharpe	This will cause traffic congestion along Clophill Road, particularly dangerous close to the school. Access will be dangerous on the brow of the hill. Large scale development would be completely inappropriate for the village. Additionally, the loss of soakaway and increase in surface water will have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties where there has been a history of flooding in the past.
Jill Mather	I agree there is a need for more housing in Maulden, but this sloping site (with drainage problems), on a main road through the village with hill and bends making access impossible, is totally unsuitable for business use or for any residential development other than low density - and no more large houses are required. Local services and infrastructure simply cannot cope with them.
John C Milligan	It is my understanding that this site has already been turned down as a development mainly due to adverse traffic impact, especially with its position so close to the local primary school. I do not see what has changed so do not understand what has merited its inclusion. In addition a development on a sloping field as this is, will I believe cause a surface water problem on the gardens of the houses on Silsoe Road and Russell Crescent, with a possible potential damage to the adjacent houses as well.
Mike Browning	As this site encompasses less than 3 hectares I do not understand how the statement "This site is put forward for a development of a broad range of housing types with large private gardens and significant areas of public open space" especially as the justification also states "this site would be best suited to a residential scheme but it would be possible to accommodate live-work units".
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	A development of this size would be totally inappropriate due to the number of additional traffic movements from two entry points onto a very busy road, despite the by pass. A further consideration is the close proximity of the Lower School which creates heavy congestion early morning and mid afternoon at a cross roads with limited visibility.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Gretel Nevols	The site is outside the Settlement Envelope for this area. What are these envelopes for if not to preserve the open countryside? Maulden School is very small and full to capacity with no room to expand. There is little public transport, only a bus once an hour in peak times and longer intervals throughout the day so your estimate of 21 minutes by public transport to reach the GP Surgery in Ampthill (which also does not stand on a public transport route) is optimistic to say the least. Also 21 minutes to the upper school in Ampthill is a timing error. The new buildings at the northern end of Silsoe Road have created a blind exit onto Ampthill Road/Clophill Road crossroads which is a potential Road Safety Hazard at the crossroads on which the school stands. This is only a short distance from the proposed site entrances in Clophill Road which is itself undulating and bends at this point.
Mrs J M Crsip	This site is of concern as no proposed numbers of dwellings are stipulated. Maulden has very limited facilities. This site would create more traffic.
Pam Cooper	The site itself may not be in a flood plain, but surface water from a built up area would drain down into Silsoe Road causing considerable water problems for housing there. Proposed access point is on a slight hill causing traffic visibility problems and also near local lower school which already causes congestion at beginning and end of school day.
Paul Whiting	Such a large development (especially if in conjunction with H118) would distort the shape of Maulden. At peak (e.g. school run) times there will be many vehicles pulling onto the Clophill Road, into what tends to be fast traffic. Neighbours on Silsoe Road already get much water coming down the hill from this site. If this development causes increased runoff, there will be a real adverse effect on the Silsoe Road dwellings. I hope that the council will find that this development will be too large to fit the core strategy.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development. The amount of infill, of what is currently agricultural land, will destroy the rural balance of the village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Norma Williams	This area of land would certainly not be suitable for large housing as the ground water which runs off this land settles in Silsoe road and is always flooding. The potential for a large unknown amount of cars entering Clophill road would be very dangerous as it approaches the School and is on a dangerous bend. A much smaller development should be considered.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H279

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	The site is contained on three sides by residential development and adjoins an arable field on the western boundary. The site is served from an access leading from Silsoe Road, which also serves a number of other residential properties. The sites containment by existing built development and mature hedging and trees on the western boundary means that it is in a secluded location and not visible from external views. The site also had planning permission for the conversion of the buildings to 11 residential units (30/MB/95891). There are many local amenities in the vicinity of the site. The site is not within or adjacent to a flood plain, the green belt or wildlife sites and SSSIs. There are no rights of way across the site, no likely areas of contamination and no issues with access. None of the site boundaries would limit the scope for residential development and residential development at the site would not conflict with neighbouring uses.

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

Submitted by	Comments
G.A.Tarrant	Would be good to allow development but only 3 or 4 dwellings; otherwise barns will fall down. Current access in very poor condition.

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
Kevin Powis	I think that this site with 150 potential houses is for a) the site b) Maulden. I also think that it will dramatically make more traffic on Silsoe rd and through Maulden. The junction onto Clophill Road from Silsoe Road will not cope and is dangerous particularly at school times. The school is already full, so where will the children go to school.
L E D Ward & Mrs G M Pasquet	Any development here would be too far from village services to be sustainable. It would not support existing social infrastructure but totally overload it (unacceptable pressure on the village school for instance). There are very few existing facilities within easy travelling distance (certainly not within walking distance) and no public transport links at all. Development here would undoubtedly create traffic congestion problems in the vicinity. The sharp bend at the junction of Silsoe Road/New Road would be a hazard for increased traffic levels and the exit on to the A507 would also be a hazard. We would point out that the site has been the subject of previous planning refusals, and is the location of a Grade 2 listed barn. Any development on this site (which is outside the village envelope) would have a significant and detrimental impact on the countryside and local environment.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Mark Leverett	I strongly oppose the development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding properties, of which, some are grade 2 listed and were built for the Duke of Bedford in 1815. The extra vehicular access required would impact on the cottages and the people that live there, who chose the location because there was little traffic and noise. It would also mean demolishing barns which have stood on the site since 1815. The rear and one side of the barns form a boundary with my own property and whilst we have put up with the state of the barns for the last 15 years we would not be able to accept suddenly having residents directly outside our front door and drive a few metres away. This would have a serious and detrimental impact on our grade 2 listed home located in a green belt area. Other sites must be more suitable with less of an impact on existing properties.
Mrs. J M crisp	Would create traffic problems, Maulden has very limited facilities.
Mrs S.M Ridgeway.	New rd, Silsoe rd, water end are virtually country lanes- water end is really a "single track rd" and I do not think that these proposed sites on these roads can be viable. The by-pass already has quite a few accidents yearly- some fatalities with the traffic volume at the moment so with increased local use I think that it will get worse. Stagecoach has stopped their bus service so no good public transport. We have no local health services only village school. post office and co-op.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H280

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	The site comprises an arable field with highway frontage to Silsoe Road and bounded by residential development to the north and the bypass to the south. The site has good access to local amenities and transport routes. The site provides an opportunity for employment development having regard to the accessibility to the A507. The site is an arable field with little or no ecological or biodiversity. The site is not within or adjoining a flood plain, conservation area, the green belt, SSSIs or country wildlife site. There are no public rights of way over the site, no known area of contamination and no problems with access. None of the site boundaries would limit the scope for residential development. Residential development of the site would not conflict with neighbouring uses.

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
Eleanor Langdon	The size of this site is likely to put a large strain on the capacities of local schools, and this must be accounted for. The position of this site is outside of the main village, and would further break up the village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Sharpe	Location separated from village is totally inappropriate for development.
David Marsh	I cannot support large scale development like this in Maulden. It would go against core strategy to load Maulden with a development of this size. The proposed site is outside the village core and would therefore create more traffic/ The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates.
Dr T and Mrs I Willcocks	This site is not suited to housing development because: 1. It is on high productivity ground, which is highly suited to multi cropping including bio-fuels production. 2. It is remote from Maulden village and its services. 3. It is located in a scenic rural greenbelt zone, a diminishing valuable resource. 4. The field has a history of being water logged. 5. The site clearly lacks water, sewage, energy or road infrastructure. 6. The social infrastructure of Maulden village (schools, transport, shops, medical facilities etc) is not suitable for such a large development.
E M Field	Outside current village centre, impinges on the traditional hamlet of Water End destroying its character, and that of the Flit valley.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
G A Thorp	Any number of houses on this site will result in more traffic to/from Ampthill bypass which is now reduced to a crawl up to the A6. Water End off Silsoe Road is at this time used as a rat run when bypass congested.
Gail Hobday	I think this site is too far out of Maulden to be part of the village.
Jacqueline Thorn	I feel a housing development here would seriously impact and damage the surrounding countryside. This site has been used every year since I've lived here (11 years) as good quality agricultural land. It sits outside the envelope of Maulden village making it not very sustainable. The local shop is a mile away and with no public transport residents would need to use motorcars to access the shop, pubs and school and in today's current car unfriendly climate makes it not very viable. A substantial area of the field is prone to flooding during the winter months.
Jill Mather	This site is essentially rural, not at all suitable for a large housing development and there are no local services or infrastructure to serve it.
John Stidworthy	It is currently enjoyed by cyclists, walkers and horse riders and any increase in traffic would be dangerous and it is currently used when the A507 is tailing back which is now happening early and early in the day when commuters are returning from work as there is a short cut past this site.
L E D Ward & Mrs G M Pasquet	Any development here would be too far from village services to be sustainable. It would not support existing social infrastructure but totally overload it (unacceptable pressure on the village school for instance). There are very few existing facilities within easy travelling distance (certainly not within walking distance) and no public transport links at all. Development here would undoubtedly create traffic congestion problems in the vicinity. The very sharp bend at the junction of Silsoe Road and New Road would be a hazard with the potential increase in traffic. Access on to the A507 is also a potential hazard. Above all, any development on this site (which is outside the village envelope) would have a hugely significant and detrimental impact on the countryside and local environment and would be totally unacceptable.
Mark Leverett	I would object to the development of housing on this site. There are no current facilities or amenities near the site. It is separate from the village itself. The extra traffic to and from the bypass would cause congestion. It is also very near the bypass and would be affected by the noise. It would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside which is a green belt area. The people living in the area chose to live there because of the open fields and countryside, they do not want it ruined by new houses. The new houses should be built on Brownfield sites or within the village itself rather than the countryside.
Michael Brooks	This is a most unsuitable site for any form of development. It is in open countryside and remote from the village. There is no public transport. Of those that have been submitted, this must be one of the most unsustainable sites in the whole District.
Mike Browning	This should not be approved because as you state: - A development of this size is unlikely to fit with the approach of the Core Strategy. The separation of this site from the main part of Maulden could raise sustainability issues.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Development on this site would be totally inappropriate being in open country and would play no part in the village scene. Although access to the A507 is close by, the Silsoe Road/New Road is very narrow and would possibly be a traffic hazard.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	This is open farmland and building would destroy the overall view. Would increase traffic congestion to A507 and Ampthill which are already congested. No specific proposals given.
Mr G.A.Tarrant	The site is remote from the village centre and lacks any transport links. Will generate many more car journeys. Access to/from A507 from New Road is currently dangerous - there are regular accidents along this stretch of road. Historical use of land - water meadows; NW corner regularly floods. Should we be building on agricultural land with food shortages projected in the long term? Well outside existing Maulden envelope and amounts to ribbon development along Silsoe Road. Will be a dormitory development for people to travel elsewhere.
Mrs J M Crisp	A development of this size is worrying. It is outside the main village, no actual number of proposed developments stipulated. Is a farmed agricultural land, which must be retained at all costs. Would create traffic problems
Mrs S.M Ridgeway.	New Road, Silsoe Road, water end are virtually country lanes- water end is really a "single track road" and I do not think that these proposed sites on these roads can be viable. The by-pass already has quite a few accidents yearly- some fatalities with the traffic volume at the moment so with increased local use I think that it will get worse. Stagecoach has stopped their bus service so no good public transport. We have no local health services only village school, post office and co-op.
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development. The amount of infill, of what is currently agricultural land, will destroy the rural balance of the village.
Sallie Phillips	A completely rural site, well away from the village, emerging onto a main road that is already prone to accidents.
Sally Marsh	I cannot support large scale development like this in Maulden. It would go against core strategy to load Maulden with a development of this size. The proposed site is outside the village core and would therefore create more traffic. The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H281

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	The site comprises a gently southerly sloping arable field with highway frontage to Water End Road and with residential development to the west, north and east. The site has good access to local amenities. The site provides an opportunity for employment development having regard to the accessibility to the A507. The site is an arable field with little or no ecological or biodiversity. The site is not within or adjoining a flood plain, a conservation area, the green belt, SSSIs or country wildlife sites. There are no public rights of way across the site, no known likely areas of contamination and no problems with access. None of the site boundaries would limit the scope for residential development. Residential development of the site would not conflict with neighbouring uses.

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
Eleanor Langdon	This is a very large site, which would potentially cause great strain on local schools capacities. Provision must be made for this. The location of this site is outside of the main village and would service to increase the current fragmented feel of the place.

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
Andrew Sharpe	Location separated from village is totally inappropriate for development.
C A Randall	Application pending for Water End to become a single track lane.
Charles J. Marshall	Apart from the sustainability issues the pressure of increased traffic on Water End which is a single track in places would be intolerable. There would be issues of water draining on to the lane caused by increased "built on land" as well.
David Marsh	I cannot support large scale development like this in Maulden. It would go against core strategy to load Maulden with a development of this size. The proposed site is outside the village core and would therefore create more traffic. The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. I would like to be consulted on what criteria will be used to decide which sites to approve.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Dr Theo and Mrs I Willcocks	<p>This site is not suited to housing development because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is on Grade 1 agricultural land, which is extremely scarce as it covers only 2% of UK land area and is highly suited to multi cropping including bio-fuels. 2. It is remote from Maulden village and its services. 3. It is located in a scenic greenbelt rural area which is a valuable finite resource. 4. The very narrow Water End road is not suited to increased traffic. 5. The site clearly lacks any water, sewage, energy or road infrastructure. 6. The social infrastructure of Maulden village (schools, transport, shops, medical facilities etc) is not suitable for such a large development.
E M Field	Development at Water End would raise problems of traffic access to A507.
G A Thorp	Water End (single track road) is already used as a rat run when Ampthill bypass congested during rush hours. There would be a large increase of traffic going onto/coming off of the bypass with resulting increased potential for accidents.
Gail Hobday	I think this site is too far out of Maulden to be part of the village.
Jacqueline Thorn	I feel a housing development here would seriously impact and damage the surrounding countryside. This site has been used every year since I've lived here (11 years) as good quality agricultural land. It sits outside the envelope of Maulden village making it not very sustainable. The local shop is a mile away and with no public transport residents would need to use motorcars to access the shop, pubs and school and in today's current car unfriendly climate makes it not very viable.
Jill Mather	Site is rural, not at all suitable for employment development or residential and with no services or infrastructure to support either.
John Stidworthy	It is currently a green field site grade 1 agricultural land. It is not suitable for development. It would not blend with the landscape and would totally destroy a rural environment which is currently enjoyed by cyclists, walkers and horse riders.
L E D Ward & Mrs G M Pasquet	<p>Any development here would be too far from village services to be sustainable. It would not support existing social infrastructure but totally overload it (unacceptable pressure on the village school for instance). There are very few existing facilities within easy travelling distance (certainly not within walking distance) and no public transport links at all. Development here would undoubtedly create traffic congestion problems in the vicinity. The sharp bend at the junction of Silsoe Road/New Road would be a hazard for increased traffic levels and the exit on to the A507 would also be a hazard.</p> <p>Above all, any development on this site (which is outside the village envelope) would have a hugely significant and detrimental impact on the countryside and local environment and would be totally unacceptable.</p>
M J Coombes	<p>Water End Road is completely unsuitable for further development. The road is a single track lane and cannot be widened due to the position of existing buildings. This makes the prospect of traffic increase unacceptably dangerous.</p> <p>Any development in the Maulden/Clophill area will only add to the already heavy congestion suffered at the Clophill A6/A507 roundabout on a daily basis.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Leverett	I would oppose the building of homes on this site. It is separate to the main village and could be unsustainable and remote. it is near the bypass and could suffer from noise. It would add to the traffic situation on and off the bypass. It would have a serious detrimental effect on the countryside and local environment. There are currently no services, facilities or amenities near the site.
Michael Brooks	This is a most unsuitable site for any form of development. It is in open countryside and remote from the village. There is no public transport, and access would have to be from a very narrow lane (Water End). Of those that have been submitted, this, like H280, must be one of the most unsustainable sites in the whole District.
Mike Browning	A development of this size cannot be seen advantageous to the village of Maulden. It is too big and I believe this request should be turned down.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	A development of this size, in this location, would be totally inappropriate as it is effectively outside the village limits and in beautiful open countryside with views to all points of the compass. Water End Lane is a very narrow country lane and the intended traffic movements to the west and east would cause tremendous problems with the existing road network.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	This is open countryside and any building work would destroy the overall view. Abuts onto water end lane, a narrow road inadequate to take extra traffic resulting from further building. Proposed development unspecified.
Mr G.A.Tarrant	The site is remote from the village centre and lacks any transport links. Will generate many more car journeys. Access to/from A507 from New Road is currently dangerous - there are regular accidents along this stretch of road. Should we be building on agricultural land with food shortages projected in the long term? Well outside existing Maulden envelope and amounts to ribbon development along Silsoe Road. Will be a dormitory development for people to travel elsewhere.
Mr R Hough	Water End Road is an unspoilt rural area with a single track road. Any development that increases traffic along Water End Road would be both foolish and dangerous. The road has no pavement and very few passing places along its 1.5 mile length. There are several blind corners. Due to several young children living in the road, any increase in traffic should constitute significant danger to pedestrians and other road users.
Mrs J Breed	Completely inappropriate use of virgin land spoiling rural landscape + this development would swamp local community
Mrs J M Crisp	This site is farmed agricultural land in a quiet area. More traffic would be generated. No number of dwellings stipulated, which is worrying. Maulden has limited facilities. This is not a suitable area for development of any kind.
Mrs S.M Ridgeway.	New Road, Silsoe Road, Water End are virtually country lanes- water end is really a "single track rd" and I do not think that these proposed sites on these roads can be viable. The by-pass already has quite a few accidents yearly- some fatalities with the traffic volume at the moment so with increased local use I think that it will get worse. Stagecoach has stopped their bus service so no good public transport. We have no local health services only village school. post office and co-op.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Adams	Local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of development. The extra traffic this development would generate would require major work to improve the A507/A6 roundabout and surrounding roads.
Sallie Phillips	A completely rural site, well away from the village, emerging onto a main road that is already prone to accidents.
Sally Marsh	I cannot support large scale development like this in Maulden. It would go against core strategy to load Maulden with a development of this size. The proposed site is outside the village core and would therefore create more traffic/ The junction with Silsoe road and Clophill road is already difficult. More traffic adds to this. Parking for the school is a major issue. The actual road Silsoe road cannot support large estates. I would like to be consulted on what criteria will be used to decide which sites to approve. I would like to be consulted on the criteria used to assess these sites.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H341**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Edward Sankey	There are good road connections to Maulden village. The site is not far from the village. There is direct access by good quality public footpath for walking or cycling, direct across the fields

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 Michael Brooks	This is an isolated site, far from the village. Access can only be by car; it is therefore unsustainable. The location has nothing to commend it and should be rejected.
Mrs J Crisp	too rural, road is not suitable for more housing/congestion

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: E18**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Sharpe	Limited development would be a good thing.
Matt Harris	Access? If this is through existing Maulden, Ampthill and Clophill area road this could be of concern.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	Smaller scale development would be preferable, excluding the shop element as this would create increased traffic movements at all times onto the Clophill Road. The site is close to the Maulden Lower School which has tremendous congestion problems at early morning and mid afternoon.

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
E M Field	This site is part of the wonderful rural view from the Greensand Ridge route and its use for industry or housing would destroy an important Bedfordshire landscape.
Richard Adams	Whilst it would be good to generate new jobs in the area I don't think this site is ideal for this sort of development. It might be better suited to the old Nursery site adjacent to the Dog and Badger PH. The local infrastructure and roads are insufficient to support this amount of proposed development.

Ref Number: E79

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr Theo Willcocks	Water End Road is very narrow - only 2m wide in places. Site is in the floodplain and a long way from Maulden village.
Mr & Mrs John Stidworthy	Yes this site has had numerous planning applications and they have all been refused. What has been proposed again went to Appeal the reference number is APP/J0215/A/08/2063417 and the appeal was refused by Peter Willows from the Planning Inspectorate at Bristol on 4 June 2008. On Sunday 3rd August 2008 a large private advertising board was placed outside the gates by the owners M and R Upton offering The Builders Yard and Auxiliary Land for sale and today the site was visited by an interested party - 7 August 2008.If you would like to view the refused planning applications this can be found on Mid Beds website under planning applications 07/01213/Full. Alternatively Rhoda Crisp would also be able to help as she sent in the details for the refusals to the Planning Inspectorate in Bristol. For all of these reasons this site is not suitable.
Mr Michael Brooks	The site is distant from the main part of the village and is in what is in effect open countryside. Access will primarily be by car since along a narrow lane (Water End), since although the bus route is some 300m from the site the service is irregular and infrequent (none on Sundays). There is also a danger that the dwellings would be built without the employment use being provided or the latter never actually taken up. This site should be rejected.
Mrs J Crisp	Water end is a small one lane track and is not suitable for any further development. development on this site has already been refused
Mrs Lynda Beer	Development of site as proposed would cause additional traffic problems - increased congestion, danger to walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Ray Hough	The proposed site is completely unsuitable for business use as per the site allocations document. Water End Road is a single track road with several blind corners and there is no pedestrian relief/pavement. The increased traffic associated with any business use would present unacceptable risk to current residents and children living in Water End. Furthermore the proposed site is in a defined floodplain.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E83

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	Could provide good employment development opportunities having regard to the accessibility to the A507 and consequently the A1 (M) and M1. The site could be used for a wide range of B1/B8 and D1 uses (i.e. institutions such as medical, administrative etc.) due to the vast amount of space, demand and location (central to the villages in the east and west). Further, the considerable pressure on available space in Ampthill and Flitwick means that the site is more appropriate for such uses (as mentioned above) and could accommodate a wide range.

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
Mr George Tarrant	The site is well outside the Maulden settlement envelope. This site is within the curtilage of a Grade II listed building. It is currently used for storage but this use could not be expanded because the site entrance is very narrow and there is insufficient space for turning within the site. While the building might be developed as offices, this would be at the expense of a loss of amenity to nearby residents. The buildings best use would be development as residential property subject to very strict limits on number of units etc.
Mr John Milligan	This proposal ,along with the three other sites put forward in SILSO ROAD, would create a massive industrial site in a village with no infrastructure to support it. It would also create considerable additional traffic on the Ampthill bypass which is already overloaded, with the resultant risk of increasing traffic accidents. Silsoe road would also have a massive increase in traffic going towards the centre of the village and would create a dangerous condition at the lower school crossroads. The road currently has more than enough heavy traffic and these four proposals would I suggest increase tenfold.
Mrs J Crisp	this is prime agricultural land and should not be developed

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E84

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	Could provide good employment development opportunities having regard to the accessibility to the A507 and consequently the A1 (M) and M1. The site could be used for a wide range of B1/B8 and D1 uses (i.e. institutions such as medical, administrative etc.) due to the vast amount of space, demand and location (central to the villages in the east and west). Further, the considerable pressure on available space in Ampthill and Flitwick means that the site is more appropriate for such uses (as mentioned above) and could accommodate a wide range.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr Theo Willcocks	Prime agricultural land in rural area way beyond the boundaries of Maulden Village.
Miss Ann Lloyd	Large or small, Maulden is a village and should remain just that. People living in Maulden chose to do so because it is a village. The aim of developers and council seems to be to turn Maulden into another Flitwick or Ampthill. We do not want that. We all have a responsibility to protect our villages for future generations. With the house building programme proposed by the Government, we should be looking at building new villages and towns and leave the existing villages alone. These views apply to all the proposed sites being discussed for Maulden.
Mr Les Ward	This site, outside the village boundaries and well removed from the centre of Maulden, is currently in agricultural use. To turn it into an area for the commercial uses proposed is merely an opportunistic move as there is no infrastructure in place and the road that serves this site is totally inadequate to carry increased volumes or sizes of vehicles. A Medical Centre in this location would be well out of reach of the population. There are no bus services as Silsoe Road is only a route to the A507.
Mr Michael Brooks	This site is effectively open countryside and as such even employment development would be inappropriate here. The last thing that would be suitable is warehousing, transport depot or any large building(s), given the impact that these would have on this rural area. At the very most, small-scale employment might be considered, but then its remoteness from the village would mean that employees would be likely to travel (by car) from further afield.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Tarrant George	This site is well outside the Maulden settlement envelope. The site is adjacent to the A507 which is a through trunk road. However, traffic speeds are high and right turns onto or off the A507 must be judged hazardous. There have been a number of accidents at a similar junction about 200m to the East along the A507. A workaround of routing traffic to the roundabout at A507/Flitwick road is not viable since the connecting country roads are too narrow. The surrounding area is dotted with small individual buildings and used mainly for crop production. A development of any size on E84 would stand out like a "sore thumb".
Mrs J Crisp	agricultural land which should not be used for development

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E85

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	Could provide good employment development opportunities having regard to the accessibility to the A507 and consequently the A1 (M) and M1. The site could be used for a wide range of B1/B8 and D1 uses (i.e. institutions such as medical, administrative etc.) due to the vast amount of space, demand and location (central to the villages in the east and west). Further, the considerable pressure on available space in Ampthill and Flitwick means that the site is more appropriate for such uses (as mentioned above) and could accommodate a wide range.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr Theo Willcocks	This field is grade 1 agricultural land and only 2% of our country is grade 1. This proposal is outside of Maulden Village. The narrow Water End Road is unsuitable for increased traffic. The area should be kept as productive agricultural land and a rural amenity.
Mr Edward Sankey	This site in rising land will be very visually intrusive, badly damaging the rural environment
Mr Les Ward	This site, currently in agricultural use and far removed from the centre of Maulden, is outside the boundaries of the village. To use this area for the commercial reasons proposed is merely opportunistic as there is no infrastructure in place and the roads are inadequate for any increase in volumes or sizes of vehicles. A Medical Centre in this location is poorly positioned as there is no public transport and the roads act merely as a route to the A507
Mr Michael Brooks	This site is effectively open countryside and as such even employment development would be inappropriate here. The last thing that would be suitable is warehousing or a transport depot given the impact that such large-scale facilities would have on this rural area. At the very most, small-scale employment might be considered, but then its remoteness from the village would mean that employees would be likely to travel (by car) from further afield.
Mr Ray Hough	Water End Road is a single track road with several blind corners and no pedestrian relief/pavement. Any increase in traffic causes significant danger to existing residents and the young children living in the road. Furthermore, the proposed site is outside the defined village boundary.
Mr Tarrant George	This site is well outside the Maulden settlement envelope. The site is adjacent to the A507 which is a through trunk road. However, traffic speeds are high and right turns onto or off the A507 must be judged hazardous. There have been a number of accidents at a similar junction about 200m to the East along the A507. A workaround of routing traffic to the roundabout at A507/Flitwick road is not viable since the connecting country roads are too narrow. The surrounding area is dotted with small individual buildings and used mainly for crop production. A development of any size on E85 would stand out like a "sore thumb".

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Crisp	agricultural land which should not be used for development

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E88

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Sunita Patel	Could provide good employment development opportunities having regard to the accessibility to the A507 and consequently the A1 (M) and M1. The site could be used for a wide range of B1/B8 and D1 uses (i.e. institutions such as medical, administrative etc.) due to the vast amount of space, demand and location (central to the villages in the east and west). Further, the considerable pressure on available space in Ampthill and Flitwick means that the site is more appropriate for such uses (as mentioned above) and could accommodate a wide range.

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
Mr George Tarrant	This site is well outside the Maulden settlement envelope. The site is adjacent to the A507 which is a through trunk road. However, traffic speeds are high and right turns onto or off the A507 must be judged hazardous. There have been a number of accidents at a similar junction about 200m to the East along the A507. A workaround of routing traffic to the roundabout at A507/Flitwick road is not viable since the connecting country roads are too narrow. The surrounding area is dotted with small individual buildings and used mainly for crop production. A development of any size on E88 would stand out like a "sore thumb".
Mr Les Ward	This site, outside the boundaries of the village and far removed from the centre of Maulden village, is currently in agricultural use. To use the site for the commercial reasons proposed is merely opportunistic as there is no infrastructure in place and the roads are inadequate for any increase in volumes or size of vehicles. A Medical Centre in this location would be poorly positioned as there is no public transport and the roads only serve as a route to the A507
Mr Michael Brooks	This site is effectively open countryside and as such even employment development would be inappropriate here. The last thing that would be suitable is warehousing, transport depot or any large building(s), given the impact that these would have on this rural area. At the very most, small-scale employment might be considered, but then its remoteness from the village would mean that employees would be likely to travel (by car) from further afield.
Mrs J Crisp	agricultural land which should not be used for development

MAULDEN APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
<p>Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association</p>	<p>H341 Brookside Farm, New Road Maulden</p>	<p>FP4 runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the proposed site. This is an important linking path to walking routes to the south of the A507, and will need to be maintained in its present status.</p>
<p>Mr. and Mrs. T Lammas</p>	<p>Maulden</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, We are long term residents of Russell Crescent, Maulden. In fact we bought our house from new in 1959. We are very concerned about the proposed developments in and around our village, but mainly in Silsoe Road which is really just a country lane and has five large proposals put forward. When we purchased our home we were assured that the area to the front of our property (ref H1 18) was green belt and would never get planning passed, in fact this applied to all of Silsoe Road. Now it appears that this is not true, and we are really concerned that it would only be a matter of time before Maulden becomes a town due to the proposed developments which would almost double the size of the village as it stands. How can anybody have faith or trust in an Authority that bows to the will of others so easily and apparently so willingly. We all accept that it is important to have housing for people who want to live and work in our area but to propose all this building in and around our village is frightening. How do we know where it will stop? A lot of sites if granted permission in the future would in our opinion open the door wider to further developments again and again. Our second concern refers to the infrastructure of the village. We currently have one shop, one post office and one lower school and limited safe play areas, it is all very well to say that developers will contribute to the provision of roads, paths, schools, doctors, dentists etc etc, but there are none evident in the proposals. The most popular routes out of the village take people through Ampthill and Flitwick for major shops etc. the situation is bad enough now. Ampthill particularly cannot cope. What will the result be from all this extra traffic? Maulden is a quiet rural village the developments proposed in Silsoe Road would create a traffic nightmare, especially at the junction of Clophill Road and Ampthill Road where the lower school stands, which is already dangerous with visibility for both pedestrians and motorists leaving Silsoe Road in either direction already being very limited. The road is relatively narrow and would not tolerate large volumes of extra traffic it is already very busy even though the by-pass was supposed to alleviate this.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr. and Mrs. T Lammas [continued]	Maulden	<p>Thirdly, what about our countryside environment? What happens to the wildlife in our lane and gardens? We currently have a wonderful selection of wild birds, even a pair of herons, owls, frogs, newts, squirrels and foxes. A vast variety of wild flowers are also growing on the land proposed for building. Lastly, the two sites which are of particular concern to us all in Russell Crescent (H118 and H233) already suffer from a certain amount of flooding. The public footpath on site H118 is currently impassable all year round due to a recent development which has created flooding. The field proposed for development which has been refused planning permission twice before (H233) has already caused flood damage in the past to several houses in our Crescent. It is entirely probable that this would worsen with more development. In addition, access to the main, already very busy Clophill Road in the region of the Lower School would be aggravated even further. Finally, we cannot state strongly enough our opposition to these proposals. Maulden would no longer enjoy the atmosphere of a true country village, which is where we chose to live. The decision would probably be made by Authorities outside our region which is appalling. How could they have any true interest or concern about the future of this idyllic part of Bedfordshire or pertain to keep its present character? This is a farming area with roads to match and if proposals were to go ahead the village would be changed and spoilt forever! Yours faithfully.</p>
Alison Bussey	Maulden	<p>I would like to register my concerns and those of my husband and daughter re the above. This part of Maulden is not well served with amenities and further significant housing will compound this problem. Bus services are poor to both Flitwick and Ampthill, leaving young people and people without cars (often but not exclusively older people) either without transport or reliant on others with cars. Car usage has increased tremendously in the past 8 years and extra housing will further compound this problem. Given there are no gym facilities or adequate shopping facilities for fresh produce or leisure facilities nearby, further use of cars will be required for yet more people. Why is more housing required in an area where facilities are already underdeveloped and public transport practically non-existent?</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Ann Swetnam	Maulden	The opening statement says that there are 39 large and small villages and provision needs to be made for 400 new homes up to 2026. This makes an average of approx. 10 (which takes us up to 2026) that planning permission would be submitted for the homes needed, through existing processes, without having to consider these extra proposed large developments. I currently live in Maulden, which is a village, and have no desire for it to become the size of a town! - you would totally destroy it! (the numbers proposed for consideration at Maulden are astronomical!). I also feel strongly that, under no circumstances, should green land sites be considered for building on. It also concerns me that most of the residents of these villages will be unaware of these massive development plans and will not have their views considered.
Robin Bartlett	Maulden	May I congratulate you and the Mid Beds Council for the recently launched web site, Talk to Mid Beds. co.uk. The site is attractive, easy to use and informative as well as being a good move by the council in communicating with its residents (assuming views submitted by residents are read and considered of course...).However I was alarmed to discover the sheer number of sites submitted by landowners and developers, and the size of some of the developments proposed. For instance, I am resident of Maulden (large village) where over 20 sites alone have been submitted including one of nearly 200 houses! Like many thousands of residents, we moved into Mid Beds from a large conurbation for specific and very good reasons, one of which was to raise a family. We enjoy living here and do our best to give back to the community, and we are therefore relying on the planning committee to make the most informed, considered and sensitive judgments before decisions are taken on future development. Good luck with the consultation process which I will follow with interest.
Nick Ley	Maulden Recommendation of an alternative site	Is there a reason why the derelict garden centre (formerly Fars Garden Centre) has not been included? You will find this site adjacent to the Dog and Badger Pub on Clophill road Maulden.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Name	Subject	Comment
Nicky Reese	Maulden, H173	<p>Thank you for the maps that you sent me. Please would you identify for me what type of housing would be proposed for the following site if it was to be developed: Ref Number: H173 Submission type: Housing Site Name/Address: Land to the North West of Maulden Submitted proposal: Development of 42 dwellings Site Area (hectares): 139 Additional information submitted: Access is proposed to be off Kings Road. District Council initial comments: Maulden is identified in the emerging Core Strategy as a Large Village. Smaller scale development would be considered here. However, this site is within the Green Belt and development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy. I presume that it is no longer considered sensible to build a complete area of social housing (e.g. Aragon Housing) without a good percentage being allocated to private housing. I know that all private housing areas need to include social housing in the scheme. Does this work the other way around, preventing problem estates from developing? Please let me know what the current policies recommend? I look forward to hearing from you</p>
Nick Ley	Maulden, H051	<p>Application ref H051, land adjacent to Sharp close. The proposal detailed on your website states that this land is not within the flood plain. I would like to point out that more than 50% of this site is at risk from flooding according to the environment agency. I refer to the Environment agency flood-map for post code MK45 2BZ (see link below). I am concerned that we could be put at greater risk of flooding should this land be developed.</p>
Ms Mary Goulder	General, Maulden	<p>I have had a look at the proposed developments. There are so many and I have completed surveys on a couple but I wish to register a general view. I am against building on green belt, park or woodland, or agricultural land, no matter where it is. Some of the developments in Maulden seem too large for a village location. I have concerns about developments in Ampthill. The centre of this little town used to be lovely, now it is always congested with traffic. In Bedford St the road is not wide enough to take a larger vehicle on one side of the road and keep traffic moving. I am against further retail outlets in the Flitwick/Ampthill area. There are vacant shops in both areas and those that have been taken are just more of gift shops and hairdressers and estate agents who want to move about. If in order to have views registered we need to take the surveys can you let me know and I will go back in and complete some more.</p>