

MEPPERSHALL 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.

MEPPERSHALL APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Ms Nicola Bickerstaff	Strutt And Parker	H174
Mr Scott Moore	Plowright Homes	H315, H318, H352

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H008

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
Mrs Arnold	I believe this site is potentially a good area for development.
P. J. Patmore	For such a large proposed development with a sole exit on to a very busy main through road right in the village centre is unacceptable. The centre of the village is very dangerous in the area of the post office, narrow road on bend and busy road junction. With no traffic alternative only a very limited development would be acceptable and safe. Also, adverse effect on popular and public footpaths accessing area of exceptional beauty.
P. Gilbert	This site is on a reasonably small scale and could be used for well-designed housing development without excessive environmental impact. Good design and planning control are essential.

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
Chris Worrell	This site should not be developed before the village school & local health services are expanded. Is Hoo Road adequate for access by construction traffic?
J Parsons	This site is one of the few amongst the submissions for Meppershall which is contained within in the general envelope of existing development.
M Cross	Comments submitted in response to other Meppershall proposals also relevant here, but if needs must this could be considered a more appropriate priority development than others in the village. The site appears to be adjacent to rather than behind any existing properties, thus minimising the impact on existing residents/properties, and would not dramatically extend the village building limits.
Mr Graham Scrase	The details relating to the site are fine as far as they go - the hedgerow described at the eastern boundary has been "tidied" recently and is not as dense as the plan would have you believe. The established hedge at the northern boundary would not apply as the realignment of Hoo Road in front of the old cottages would be uprooted in favour of the new road. The upgrading of the bridleway to an adoptable road will greatly increase the volume and, more particularly, the speed of traffic in this quiet corner of the village. The extra housing will further overload the foul water sewer, which already empties directly into my garden - raw sewerage a foot or more deep is not pleasant. The outlook from the cottages, which has been part of their charm for years, will be lost for ever.

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
Albane Quesnot	<p>Access through Hoo Road will create congestion and parking problems on that road. Potential alternative access through Fildyke Rd would have the same adverse effects.</p> <p>This site adjoins a nature reserve and should be maintained as field, to prevent impact on the wildlife in that reserve.</p>
J West	<p>The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.</p>
Liz Hughes	<p>I am very concerned that there is a possibility of house building on The Mow. The cottages along Hoo Road have already been reduced in rental and selling value due to the culvert installed against original planning applications in Hoo Road. Planning permission has been refused before on this site due to the unmade road surface (bridleway) and problems with access. I have to say that I unfortunately I am not surprised now that a new sewage pipe has been installed across the Mow for the new builds on Fildyke Road, again against original planning drawings!! I bet that Wheatley Homes again get the job for the new housing in The Mow. I would like to see some plans for the planning application as soon as possible as no information has been put up locally.</p>
Lyn Thomas	<p>18 dwellings have the potential of adding 54 extra vehicles to-ing and fro-ing along Hoo Road - a road which is already congested. Albeit that the road is probably "big" enough to accept this traffic, in a strictly technical sense, it makes little sense to inflict the residents of Hoo Road (including those who will inhabit the new houses) with all the increased vehicle flows. The road is, to all intents and purposes, a cul-de-sac; a fact that already causes problems with ease of passage - most delivery vans and the refuse vehicle have to reverse either up or down. At peak times Hoo Road could become chaotic - hardly the ingredients for pleasant "social infrastructures". Whatever gain there may be to local services it will be at the cost of Hoo Road's residents' quality of life.</p>
Melissa Cullen	<p>The newly built housing estate at the rear of this site is already causing noise pollution problems with the continuous sound of house alarms. Quite frankly, any more would cause a serious environmental problem.</p>
Mr P J Challinor	<p>This proposal would create traffic congestion problems within Hoo Road and the access point onto Shefford Road. The proposed access point onto the plot is a single track lane which is totally unsuitable for any traffic increase. Any increase in traffic within the Hoo road environment would have a severe impact on the local area. Furthermore this is a green field site. Development of any kind on this type of plot should be avoided at all costs. There are plenty of brown field sites within local towns etc. which should be developed first.</p>
Mr S Moore	<p>Development here would represent an obvious intrusion into the open countryside, particularly prominent from Hoo Road. The Council's previous refusal of applications for development on the northern part of the site has been upheld at appeal due to site specific concerns. The site isn't large enough to assist with community facilities.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
T. McMairn	No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what’s left of it! 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H011

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
Chris Worrell	Consideration should be given to ensuring that construction traffic is not routed through 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
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals also relevant here. However, if needs must a carefully planned but limited development would not be totally out of place/character with the immediate locality and village building limits would not be affected too significantly.
Mrs Hazel Arnold	I believe this site could cause potential traffic problems it is a dangerous road as it is and more traffic could cause major problems.
P. Gilbert	This site might be suitable for sympathetic development but there could be real problems regarding access and traffic joining the existing road.

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
J Parsons	This site lies at the extreme edge of the village and opposite to the Conservation Area and would have a major impact upon it. The site has already been the subject of an appeal against refusal of permission and was rejected by the inspector. The site borders open farmland in an elevated position and would have a significant detrimental impact on its surroundings and its neighbours.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
Jackie Bond	Access to Shillington Road dangerous - blind entrance/exit -spoil entrance to village from Shillington aesthetically overdevelopment of the village envelope. -over development of the site.
Mr S Moore	The site is on the outskirts of the village, some distance from most of the village facilities. Its limited size will mean in cannot provide a good mix of units, including affordable housing. The need to protect the amenity of adjoining residential development could further restrict the development potential of the site. Its edge of village location, adjoining the Conservation Area, will also increase its prominence in the surroundings, and potentially adversely affect the character of the area.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr T Wilksinson B.Eng, C, ENg, Mice, Mihe	Outside settlement envelope for the village defined in local plan. Development would be on skyline and visible from a long distance. Exit onto road with fast moving traffic.
Mrs J. Hickling	It would create a presumption for more ribbon development along Shillington Road. It would also encourage development in depth. Due to local topography it would be visually intrusive from many directions. Access to the site from the road would be visually poor and therefore dangerous. There are more than 2 properties that would be affected.
Mrs. Julie Stock	I don't think it is the best place for future development when it is located next to an existing conservation site.
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what's left of it!</p> <p>1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.</p>

Ref Number: H016

Please note this site has been withdrawn by the promoter from the site allocations process.

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
Mrs H Arnold	This site is not too large for the village and also is on the main route into Shefford and so in my opinion a good development.

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
P. Gilbert	This site would seem to be linked with H174. It might be a suitable site ; however if H174 were not to be deemed suitable, I would be opposed to development west of the existing building line along Shefford Road/High Street.

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
J Parsons	This site would infill one of the few breaks in the ribbon development of Shefford Road and should be resisted for that reason
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals also apply. In general, and in comparison to other potential village developments, this would be totally unsuitable from a location perspective; little more than a blot on the landscape.
Mr P J Challinor	This is mainly a green field site. Development of any kind on this type of land should be avoided if possible. The traffic generated by this proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the village of Meppershall.
Mr S Moore	Site is limited in size, with much of the area consisting of the access road. As a result unlikely to be able to provide good mix of units, including affordable housing. Would result in backland development, out of character with the surrounding built environment. Access road likely to have an adverse impact upon residential amenity of adjoining properties. Access onto Shefford Road would be in close proximity to another junction, with resulting highway safety concerns.

Submitted by	Comments
Paul Smith	Development of this site would introduce significant, and potentially dangerous, 4 way traffic issues by creating a junction opposite existing Orchard Close across Shefford Road. Additionally the pedestrian path along Shefford Road is on the opposite side of the road which would result in difficult pedestrian access to the proposed development across this new junction. The demolition of an existing quality property to create an access road to a development behind the existing building line is unnecessary when there are many more appropriate unused or derelict sites within the village boundary.
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what’s left of it!</p> <p>1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.</p>

Ref Number: H034

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
Mr S Moore	<p>The Council should favour the development of appropriately located brown field sites, such as this, ahead of green field sites.</p> <p>A combination of its established developed nature, natural contours and adjoining buildings will ensure that there will be no intrusion into the countryside.</p> <p>The site is large enough to provide a good mix of residential units, including affordable housing, small scale employment provision, plus local facilities such as a Doctors Surgery and/or a replacement Community Hall.</p> <p>A safe access can be introduced to High Street. The significant plot width will enable appropriate frontage development, thereby enhancing the High Street.</p> <p>The site is well located within the village, enabling easy access to facilities and services, including the bus stop adjoining the site.</p> <p>Previous Local Plan Inspectors have recognised that the site could be appropriate for housing, if allocations are required at Meppershall.</p>

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 Geneux	<p>As a nearby resident I have resigned myself that building may take place on this site. However the size of this proposal is totally disproportionate.</p> <p>Presumably access will be onto the High Street very close to the School. This is already a congested area. The combination of lots more traffic in an area where there are lots of children is not a good one. This does not seem to offer anything apart from help the Village meet targets for housing set upon it. If it is considered viable why not a much smaller scale of executive housing more in keeping with the surrounding houses. Overall I'm still not in favour.</p>
Chris Worrell	<p>Far too large a development. Would create another disaster such as the recent Bovis development. Serious environmental issues would result especially during construction. The village cannot accept 55 more houses on one site.</p>
David Heath	<p>There should be no further large developments as it would lose its village identity. Some anti-social behaviour has already been attributed to occupants on the so-called affordable/social housing and the possibility of more housing of this nature is NOT acceptable - particularly in view of the fact that our local community police officer has now been withdrawn. The High Street is now a very busy road with too many cars parked on it and the impact of this extra housing will place considerable extra strain on it.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
David Turner	<p>This site is unsuitable for development, being outside the village development envelope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is also close to an area of historical and archaeological importance (John Bunyan trail and motte and bailey of manor house and church) and this scale of the proposals are unacceptable for the village - Significant additional traffic and noise would also result - This is a very dangerous bend (Campton Road/High Street turn).
Haynes	<p>Our village has already been swamped by the large Bovis Estate - another of similar size and type is unlikely to be received well. Just because the piece of land is large, why does it have to be so heavily populated? We would all benefit from a bit more space around us.</p>
J Gilbert	<p>Congestion at the top of the village is already a problem and there is insufficient space to widen the road. Access via the winding road to Campton would be dangerous. Gregory Close was a hated, ugly and inappropriate addition the village. Integration with existing village has been problematic. 3 storey houses should be banned in villages.</p>
J Parsons	<p>This large site lies to the rear of the existing development envelope and as such could if granted result in irresistible demands for the development of several similar land packages along the High Street. Meppershall is currently assimilating the results of large numbers of new houses in recent years and cannot cope with further large sites.</p>
J West	<p>The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.</p>
M Cross	<p>Very inappropriate extension to current village/High St building line. Certainly anything based on Gregory's Close housing design (i.e. predominantly 3 story houses) would be most inappropriate to current buildings/residents mix. Access to/along High St. etc would also be a major issue (accidents have happened). During (the closely situated) school hours particularly, traffic along the High St is already an issue with larger vehicles having been seen mounting pavements because of parked cars. Another large development in the village is not desirable for the foreseeable future; overall infra-structure is inadequate. Goes against governmental environmental/climate needs to minimise car journeys for school, work, health & other purposes (such developments should be in larger towns where good infra-structure is already in place).</p>
Mrs E C Wilson	<p>There are enough problems with traffic in this area - the school is opposite (practically) cars from the schools are parked all day. I cannot get out of my driveway, with cars parked on one side, reducing the driving cars to a single line. The road cannot cope with a single line. The road cannot cope with the traffic now, without adding more houses and cars.</p>
Mrs Hazel Arnold	<p>The village does not have the capacity to cope either with traffic or other facilities for another development the size of the Gregory Close Coneygate development if you must develop the village please consider one or two small sites of say 20 houses on each rather than that of the Gregory Close size of nearer 100 which is now getting messy and untidy due to pathways and bushes not being looked after.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Bull	The village of Meppershall is not suitable for further development - there have been enough new houses built already.
Mrs. Julie Stock	We have recently had a large scale development at Gregory Close. I don't think we need another of similar size in such close proximity.
Stephen Doe	The last thing we need in this village is another large estate the last one significantly increased the local petty crime rate.
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it!</p> <p>1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H035

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

Submitted by	Comments
D P Thomas	This site provides a significant enhancement to the proposals under H035 "Bury Nurseries". The additional area being flat and level with sweeping views through a Southwest to East arc, which would greatly improve the scope for an aesthetically pleasing and amenity rich medium sized development. Inclusion of the site ensures both a logical extension of the existing settlement envelope and clear and well defined boundaries.

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
J Gilbert	Congestion at the top of the village is already a problem and there is insufficient space to widen the road. Access via the winding road to Campton would be dangerous. Gregory Close was a hated, ugly and inappropriate addition the village. Integration with existing village has been problematic. 3 storey houses should be banned in villages.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals also apply. In general, and in comparison to other potential village developments, this would be totally unsuitable from a location perspective; little more than a blot on the landscape.
Mr S Moore	Not clear how access from High Street into the site will be gained, but presumably will require demolition of existing dwelling(s) and likely to harm amenity of remaining dwellings. Isolated, back land development will be out of character with the existing built environment. Limited size of site will mean a good mix of units, including affordable housing cannot be provided.
T. McMairn	No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what's left of it! 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H045

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
Eric Larsen	This site is ideally situated for all local amenities i.e. railway stations, shop, bypass, and would avoid traffic travelling through the already heavily congested high street of the village.
G. Larson	My belief is that this smallish site would be much better used, providing much needed housing, with low impact to the congestion of the village, rather than a derelict relic from the past serving absolutely no purpose or potential whatsoever in its present form.
Steve Larson	This site is situated on the outskirts of the village and would not cause any impact traffic-wise to the centre of the village, unlike the larger Bovis type estate as is already proven. The site is currently a hazard due to 9 broken down partly glazed glass houses, with glass flying all over the place when we, as we have just had, have strong winds and storms. This site could be much better used for much needed housing especially starter homes.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H Arnold	Although this site would not have a significant impact on the local environment My concern would be the traffic the roads on that side of the village would struggle to cope and become dangerous as it is only a country lane type road.
P B Longland	The entry/exit to this site is situated at a narrow and hazardous section of Fildyke Road. The existing access would need substantially widening to enable traffic to enter/exit the finished development. The road drainage at this point is inadequate and liable to occasional flooding. The provision of footpaths has proved controversial and would need significant restructuring of the road drains.

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
Albane Quesnot	No direct access to site. Access would potentially be through site ref H125. Access to the site is through a very narrow passageway (one car width) and therefore is not appropriate for use by several households. Access onto Fildyke Road and potential parking overflow would create congestion on a portion of the already made dangerous by cars parked outside recently built houses. Meppershall does not have suitable public transport links to cater for a growing population.
Graham Gardiner	Meppershall village infrastructure is extremely limited. Fildyke Road is already congested as a result of recent housing developments. There are existing road safety concerns which stem from the lack of street lighting or pavement at the Manor Farm end of the road. Public transport is sparse and the mains drainage seems just about able to cope with existing requirements. Further development will only exacerbate an already deteriorating situation.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals relevant here. Should not be considered a priority site as it appears likely to overlook existing properties. Given current predictions of increasing world food shortages and high raw food prices the land would be better returned to full agricultural use.
Mr Boulton	Traffic and double parking is already an issue in this area.
Mr S Moore	Site is on village outskirts and its development would represent an obvious intrusion into the open countryside, easily apparent from nearby public viewpoints. It's the furthest of all identified sites from the school, which is the most used local facility. The site is not large enough, or appropriately located, to provide additional community facilities. The route of access onto Fildyke Rd is not clear. The existing access would appear to be insufficient to serve the site.
Mrs P Standbridge	The entrance will be along Fildyke road which is effectively a single lane due the width and parked cars at each end. It is extremely narrow at the point of the entrance for this proposed plan and often causes problems for buses and lorries etc. Also there is no footpath which makes it extremely dangerous for pedestrians living along Fildyke Road and also any new residents in the proposed development. The houses opposite all park outside the houses and I cannot see how lorries etc will be able to turn into the proposed entrance. Also will Fildyke Road be able to cope with the increased sewage etc? There are also already problems with flooding in parts of Fildyke road.
Mrs. Julie Stock	We have recently had 2 new developments at this end of Fildyke Road. It is almost impossible to get along the road now as it is because of the increased number of cars parking on it and further development will only make it more difficult for residents.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Shireen Longland	In the last 20 years there have been enough new houses built on it just off Fildyke Road - at least 60. The road is very narrow in some places. Even where the new houses HAVE car spaces off road they park on the road. The buses are somewhat haphazard in time keeping, and no one who has lived all their lives in the village is happy with the idea of even more non-participant "village people".
Stephen Doe	Again this is the most congested part of the village.
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H069**

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
Chris Worrell	Construction traffic must not be routed through 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
Dr Michael Cole	The fine old village church and graveyard, the historic manor house and the hill top Motte and Bailey are all in close proximity to the site which also present fine vistas which should be preserved. Encroachments within this conservation area would spoil this, the most picturesque and rural part of the village
Haynes	This site would spoil one of the prettiest parts of the village. The wide frontages would only be used for cars; camper vans etc. so the view would not be maintained, especially travelling towards Shillington. This space should be kept open for the enjoyment of residents and those visiting the church and churchyard.
J Parsons	This site lies in the Conservation area. It is inconceivable that any development could be undertaken without the most severe detrimental effect on the conservation area. It is likely that the site contains remains of the early settlement around the church and castle (refer County Archaeology).
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
Jean M Cole	The site extends the building outside the natural boundary of the village and crosses the footpath and meadow used by many villagers for leisure as well as access to the church. A footpath between new houses is not a suitable alternative to walking through a wild flower meadow which would be appreciated by many who many come to live in the village in the future.
M Cross	Most definitely an undesirable proposal which should be rejected at all costs. Despite comments accompanying the application, any residential development on this land is bound to adversely affect existing public views, and relative seclusion, of the church. All the land covered/mentioned in this proposal should be acquired to provide an extension to the existing church yard/cemetery along with some much needed parking space for church users. There is a public footpath running across the land which could be incorporated into such a church extension.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Matthew Collins	The site sits at virtually the highest point of the village and in a conservation area. We doubt very much if any proposed dwellings would in any way enhance the character of the area and flies in the face of the idea of this area being conserved. Meppershall has a fairly high throughput of traffic passing through it to other villages further afield from the A507. As a consequence this combined with the fact that these roads are often walked by elderly people, horses and small children on bicycles make any site and its requisite entrance highly dangerous on this narrow, bendy stretch of road which has very poor sight lines. This would not be a suitable site for any proposed housing development.
Mr & Mrs Power	1. The site (HO69) has a public right of way crossing through it, regularly used by villagers. 2. This site has much archaeological interest. The location has been used as a settlement for centuries encompassing the nearby Manor House. 3. This site is a conservation area. There are more suitable areas within the village which are waste ground, built on previously and now lie idle such as H011 and H070. 4. The site is accessed by Shillington Road, which is narrow and has poor visibility when approaching Meppershall from Shillington. 5. There is no footpath on Shillington Road to access the site for pedestrians other than via the churchyard. 6. We've been neighbours of St Mary's church for over 15 years and in common with many other churches we've seen a decline in visitors. A typical congregation is between 6-12 cars and there is plentiful parking to the front of the church. Parking surfacing would destroy the habitat of local wildlife, including the rare black squirrel.
Mr S Moore	This is an isolated green field site, which has been considered by the previous Local Plan Inspector to significantly contribute to the setting of the nearby Church, a listed building. He also considered housing at the site would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. All of these concerns are equally relevant now and should prevent any future development of the site. The suggested introduction of 3 or 4 dwellings to the site would not enable a good mix of units and would not assist with the provision of affordable housing in the village.
Mr T Wilkinson, B. Eng, C. Eng, MICE, MIHT	Outside settlement envelope for village defined in local plan. Development would be on skyline and visible from a long distance. Exit onto road with poor visibility and fast moving traffic.
Mrs J. Hickling	This is the only really attractive part of Meppershall and it is a core part of the conservation area. It offers lovely views of the beautiful Church. There is no way that any type of development could augment this view, it could only be detrimental. The footpath is heavily used which underlines the appreciation by the residents of this area. Any development would also create the potential for more development along Shillington Road on the other side. At present the existing settlements/boundaries make a defining end to the village. It would be a tragedy if this site was developed.
P.Gilbert	This site is too close to the Church for development. Despite assurances, the existing view from Shillington Road to the Church would be severely affected. As this is one of the few attractive angles to view our ancient Church, this land should be left alone.

Submitted by	Comments
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what’s left of it!</p> <p>1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.</p>
Terry Smyth	<p>There is already too much traffic in the village, too few jobs within the locality (factory units in Shefford are being turned into houses), poor public transport) and no infrastructure within the village to support more houses.</p> <p>There are other issues such as:</p> <p>1) Lack of infrastructure to support more houses 2) lack of policing 3) The additional housing will also destroy the character of the village by increasing the size of the village and destroying and obstructing views 4) Disturbance caused by the aero-gliders and light aircraft from RAF Henlow. This disturbance takes the form of both noise and low flying aircraft over the village. The additional housing will possibly cause the aircraft to fly over a narrower route causing more disturbance to the people living below the routes.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H070

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
Chris Worrell	Construction traffic must not be routed through the village.
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals may apply. However, even though it would extend the current village building limits, if needs really must it could be a site for relative priority development on the grounds that it would be adjacent to rather than behind any existing residential properties.
Mrs H Arnold	Although this site is small the traffic on to the Stondon Road which is very well used at the moment may cause some problems as there is no path and it can be quite dangerous.

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
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
Jackie Bond	Overdevelopment of rural entrance/views from Stondon - Overdevelopment of village envelope - Blind access to Stondon Road - Other sites available with less direct impact on village.
Matt Collins	Similar to my comments for H069. The site sits at virtually the highest point of the village and in/next to a conservation area. Any proposed dwellings would not in any way enhance the character of the area and flies in the face of the idea of this area being conserved. Meppershall has a fairly high throughput of traffic (including large/farm vehicles) passing through it to other villages further afield from the A507. As a consequence this combined with the fact that these roads are often walked by elderly people, horses and small children on bicycles make any site and its requisite entrance highly dangerous on this narrow stretch of road which has a particularly dangerous blind corner and very poor sight lines. This would not be a suitable site for any proposed housing development.
Mr S Moore	Development on this site would represent an obvious extension to the village and be seen as a clear intrusion into the countryside, from many public viewpoints. Being located at the southern most boundary of the village, it lies a considerable distance from many of the community facilities. The sites limited size means that it could not provide additional community facilities and is poorly located to provide them in any case.
Stephen Doe	There are significant road safety issues with this site.

Submitted by	Comments
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what’s left of it!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools.2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already.3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H074

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H Arnold	Although this is a good site for development I am concerned as we have just had a new development off Fildike road not far from this site which has increased the traffic and so parking on the road has increased and driving down Fildike is becoming more hazardous and another development coming on to the road will cause more problems I do not believe the small roads in Meppershall can cope with the parking and traffic and as such the best site for development is on the Shefford Road.
P. Gilbert	Existing recent development along Fildyke road has caused significant traffic problems to local residents. Development of more houses here should be considered carefully in this light; there appears to be little thought given to it so far these comments also apply to site H125.
Stephen Doe	Although this is most congested part of the village 3 additional dwellings would not make that much difference 9 however would be noticeable.

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
Albane Quesnot	This site adjoins a nature reserve and therefore should be kept as field or similar agricultural land (currently equestrian paddocks), in order to prevent adverse effect on the wildlife within that reserve. Access to the site is through a very narrow passageway (one car width) and therefore is not appropriate for use by several households. Meppershall does not have suitable public transport links to cater for a growing population.
Bradley Jackson	The access to plot H074 is indicated from Fildyke Rd along a narrow access road. This access would not comply with current regulations for access for the fire service for two reasons. 1) The narrowest point along the access road is 3.4m between the boundary fences of numbers 35 & 43. The regulations state that the Fire Service requires clear access of 3.7m between kerbs. Access to this plot for the Fire Service is therefore impossible using this road. 2) The length of the road from Fildyke Rd to the plot is greater than 45m, therefore the Fire Brigade could not reach any proposed new dwellings from Fildyke Rd. The length and width of the proposed access road could not possibly facilitate access and egress for the amount of vehicles that would be using this road under the proposed number of new dwellings.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Chapman	The access shown is wholly unsuitable due to insufficient width and would make an additional housing access road to the other side of No. 35 to add to the other 4 access roads within 50 metres on an unsighted bend. Notwithstanding putting No.35 on an island, surely it will exacerbate the traffic dangers in this area particularly when cars are parked in Fildyke Road.
Melissa Cullen	Fildyke Road is already a busy and cramped road, extra housing will only exacerbate an already difficult problem.
Mervyn Morgan	The details for this site are wrong. It is not behind 37 Fildyke Road, but behind 43,45,47,49,51 and 53. No one from the council has contact the residents about this proposal. In addition the access to this site is limited to a shared cart path with No 43 Fildyke Road, it is not wide enough for emergency vehicles.
Mr & Mrs Darby	We do not support the development of this site. There is an issue with "access by a range of vehicles". Existing width is only 3.1 metres. There has been enough development in Fildyke road already without "cramming" houses in every available space. The whole point of rural living is not to have developments all on top of each other. This land butts the public footpath to the conservation area and the conservation area itself, we believe it should be left as it is or incorporated into the conservation area. Meppershall has plenty of larger more suitable sites that have been applied for, that with developers being forced to make contributions in various ways would support the village better and meet Government targets. Thank you.
Mr S Moore	Limited size of site would mean that it cannot provide a good mix of dwellings, including affordable housing provision, and definitely could not assist with the provision of community facilities. Access way connecting with Fildyke Road appears insufficient in width to safely accommodate residential development. Use of proposed access could adversely affect the amenity of adjoining properties.
Mrs P Standbridge	Access to the land is on Fildyke Road - a single narrow lane. We have problems with buses, refuse trucks trying to get through causing tail backs and cars having to reverse down the road. This is made worse by the fact there is no footpath in parts. It is very dangerous for pedestrians. There are problems with parking along each end of Fildyke Road and will be worse if these proposals go through. The Lyspitt Common development has just finished and caused problems with traffic, and their residents parking on Fildyke Road. The mobile library has problems too. The land should be used to extend the existing nature reserve which is a valuable resource for the community and the only one of its kind in the village. It's a wonderful resource for children growing up in Meppershall and a sanctuary for residents and should be extended onto this land. We could also benefit from a children's play area and more picnic tables there.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Tracey Fairey	I feel that the immediate vicinity would become over developed taking into account the recent housing developments around this site. I also feel that there is very restricted access to the site, which could cause a number of problems to both traffic leading to one of the main roads through Meppershall and a potential risk to pedestrians. I feel that the village could soon become overpopulated for the present infrastructure of the village. I feel that the site description is misleading. The site was privately rented to stable 3 horses and I feel that the site would still adequately support this. As far as I am aware, the site was not used as a School of Equestrian which to me implies a business. I would also like to stress that the site is adjacent to Parish open space (nature area) which could be encroached/disrupted by further building work. I feel that now the owner has moved away from the area, she does not have the village's best interest at heart.
Mrs. Julie Stock	I feel that there has been enough development down this end of Fildyke Road recently and the impact of extra traffic and parked cars has been significant.
Phillip and May King	There are a number of points wrong with the details attached to this site. 1. There is no barn only two small wooden stable sheds (not brick). 2. It is not adjacent to old Glass Houses it is adjacent to woodland. 3. The access to this site is not 3 meters but 6 feet, as shown on the land registry documentation. 4. The access to this site is at the side of No 43 Fildyke Road and not as stated in the documentation.
Stephen Doe	Recent housing development has made this road effectively one way at peak times. This development would only add to the problem.
T. McMairn	No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it! 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H125

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. Larsen	This site has a good access to the new Shefford bypass and is accessible to both Arlesey and Hitchin Railway stations avoiding the already congested Meppershall High Street. Easy distance from shops and centre of village, buses routed in Fildyke Road. A very good accessible site for all services.
R M Smith	I would support H125 as logical in-filling without substantially increasing the village boundary.

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
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals relevant here. Should not be considered a priority site as it appears likely to overlook existing properties. Given current predictions of increasing world food shortages and high raw food prices the land would be better returned to full agricultural use.
P B Longland	The entry/exit to this site is situated at a narrow and hazardous section of Fildyke Road. The existing access would need substantially widening to enable traffic to enter/exit the finished development. The road drainage at this point is inadequate and liable to occasional flooding. The provision of footpaths has proved controversial and would need significant restructuring of the road drains.
Stephen Doe	If developed it is essential that the number of dwelling is at the minimum.

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
Albane Quesnot	Access to the site is through a very narrow passageway (one car width) and therefore is not appropriate for use by several households. Access onto Fildyke Road and potential parking overflow would create congestion on a portion of the already made dangerous by cars parked outside recently built houses. Meppershall does not have suitable public transport links to cater for a growing population.
Chris Worrell	Fildyke Road is already congested. Can it take any more development?
Haynes	There has been significant building in Fildyke Road in recent years and along with the larger estate in the village, the traffic now using the road has increased enormously. 15 houses would generate at least another 20 cars pulling out onto what is already a busy and narrow part of this road.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
Mr Boulton	Traffic and double parking is already an issue in this area
Mr S Moore	Would represent an obvious intrusion into the countryside from nearby public viewpoints. Is of insufficient size to provide community facilities and located at the eastern edge of the village, so not well sited to do so. Previous Local Plan Inspector has advised that the site should not be allocated for housing, noting that better locations within Meppershall could be found to assist with the future supply of housing.
Mrs. Julie Stock	We have had enough development along Fildyke Road in my opinion and the area cannot support any further traffic.
Stephen Doe	Once again we have proposed development in an area where recent development has effectively made the road one way at peak times. Third try for this area, same congestion problem as before.
T. McMairn	No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside – what’s left of it! 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H174

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 Geneux	This proposal genuinely offers something for the people of Meppershall. Undoubtedly it will have a negative effect on the existing housing and will have its access road in the narrow midpoint of the village causing congestion. The potential of a new School and Community centre and developed playing field would benefit the village. The Grave yard is required. As usual it would be nice if it could be scaled down slightly, but if this was the one proposal accepted to meet Meppershall's contribution to the 400 new homes at least the village would benefit significantly from it and that must be a good thing.
David Foskett	The provision of a new village hall / community centre is very important as the existing hall will become unusable in the next few years. The current hall is used all day every day of the week and the only way to fund a replacement is via planning gain.
J L Waite	This site would provide the village with much needed facilities eg new community hall, cemetery and eventually a new school.
Mr P.J Patmore	For such a large proposed development with a sole exit onto a very busy main through road right in the village centre is unacceptable. The centre of the village is very dangerous in the area of the post office, narrow road on bend and busy road junction. With no traffic alternative only a very limited development would be acceptable & safe. Also adverse effect on popular and public footpaths accessing area of exceptional beauty.
Ms Louise Hutson	The village is in desperate need for a new community centre, pre-school and lower school facilities. This development would provide all of these.
Nicola Bickerstaff	<p>We support the development proposal at H174. Along with the housing element of the scheme, the proposal will strengthen the viability and vitality of the village and improve the passage of traffic, through the provision of a new Community Hall, playing fields, GP Surgery, and Cemetery for the village. There is also provision for a replacement primary school when required.</p> <p>The proposed development would support existing services such as the village lower school, shop, bakery, and post office, located on High Street in the village.</p> <p>The site is considered to have facilities within easy travelling distances. The hourly 79 bus service travels between Meppershall and Luton, 6 days a week, and stops at nearby service centre, Shefford, approximately 1.5 miles north of the village.</p> <p>Site H174 is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Meppershall and is considered to be well related to the built form of the village, and would not have a significant impact on the countryside.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
P. Gilbert	If future development on a single larger site in Meppershall is to be considered then this proposal is the only one that offers any additional benefit to residents other than extra congestion and disruption from the already continuous building work in the village. 68 houses is a lot however, given the large number very recently constructed in the appalling Gregory's Close development. However, this site could help us retain and even expand village services. Any development should be sympathetic to existing residents, especially at the south western part of the site, where perhaps an environmental barrier should be considered. Add a new pub and village acceptance would be guaranteed. No more 3 storey 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
Albane Quesnot	<p>This proposed development, although major, seems the most appropriate, on the condition that community facilities are included in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new community/village hall, designed to support all necessary activities/clubs; - new lower/primary school; - new pre-school, potentially included in either of the above; - playing fields. <p>Adequate car parking facilities must also be included (that means to assume 2 cars per household as a minimum, and 3 to 4 for family homes).</p>
J Parsons	<p>This site is a significant area to the rear of the existing development envelope. There are a large number of land parcels to the west of the village and development of this site could set an irresistible precedence. The site offers a large number of houses; Meppershall is still assimilating the large numbers of new build of recent years.</p>
M Cross	<p>Whilst another large development within the village boundaries is far from desirable, and despite the potential impact on village building lines, of all the options listed this could be the most appropriate for consideration. It would be at the heart/focal point of the village in the immediate vicinity of/adjacent to pub, village hall/community centre and post office/shop (for as long as it might remain given current intentions to close most rural post offices and thus potentially make the shop unviable!). The potential for a replacement expanded primary school (being more central, should reduce/eliminate need for ANY parental car journeys to & from) and new community centre on the site would also be advantageous/beneficial for all village residents. Not sure about a cemetery; rather inappropriate to a housing area - for various reasons, ways should be found to expand existing site around the church. Infrastructure & environment/climate comments to site ref. H034 are also relevant.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Raymond Johnson	Taking into account all of the potential development plots of the village leaves me to believe that there could be some 290 additional dwellings constructed in the future. This could lead an additional educational requirement for primary age children totalling some 500 places. It is blatantly obvious the Meppershall lower school does not have this capacity. It seems to me that thought should be given to the construction of a nursery-primary-middle school to take over the existing fragmented structure (multi level) and accommodate the potential future intake.

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
Chris Worrell	The village does not need another disaster such as the recent Bovis development especially the considerable encroachment into the countryside behind the village hall. We should not be blinded by promises of new infrastructure. IF this development is allowed to proceed it should with its central location include accommodation for the elderly & for starter homes.
David Heath	There should be no further large developments as it would lose its village identity. Some anti-social behaviour has already been attributed to occupants on the so-called affordable/social housing and the possibility of more housing of this nature is NOT acceptable - particularly in view of the fact that our local community police officer has now been withdrawn.
Dawn Addams	The village of Meppershall is already too big. The schools in the area are unable to support a bigger community. I would therefore think that the amount of housing all over Meppershall would be too much. The Lower School and Middle School are already full to capacity.
Haynes	This site would make Meppershall more like a small town than a large village. If there was any chance of a Doctors surgery being built, it is unlikely to be solely for Meppershall's residents and it will generate patients from other areas to use the facility, causing more traffic problems here. The surgery in Shefford already provides support for the local area and it would make better sense to provide a new surgery in a part of Mid Beds that isn't so well catered for. Perhaps you should consider H069 for the purpose of the cemetery - it will not block the views of the church and is after all, a more appropriate place!
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Chapman	<p>This site encroaches far too far into the (what is laughingly now called) Green Belt on a steep slope jutting out into the countryside and which cannot be adequately screened from the surrounding area.</p> <p>Any large scale development in Meppershall will cause potential unacceptable increases in traffic and the dangers attached. We already have large scale rat running to the A507 bypass which has added to the increased traffic caused by The Acres development. Much of this traffic flouts the speed limit and is especially dangerous around the Village Stores - a major accident is just waiting to happen there as there is not even a kerb on the shop side of the road.</p> <p>To add another major outlet into the High Street around the village hall area would just be madness.</p>
Melissa Cullen	<p>This is a popular area for children, dog walkers and many members of the village community. It is an unspoilt part of Meppershall and should remain so.</p>
Mr Alan Gudgin	<p>Site is far too large and although central to the village is a major alteration to the green belt in its site. I believe that other sites in the village envelope have better reasons for their usages from which funding for community projects could be obtained. The village hall/sports facilities are a must but I feel a new school and doctor's surgery a step too far. Please take this mail as my view in your planning appraisal.</p>
Mr P J Challinor	<p>This is a green field site currently serving as the village playing field and recreation ground. It would be disgraceful if this site was submitted for development and result in a great deal of local village opposition. Furthermore, Meppershall does not currently require a new lower/primary school and all health care is adequately covered by Shefford and Stondon nurseries. This proposal would seriously affect traffic congestion within the village due to the number of proposed new homes. The infrastructure of Meppershall is unable to support or cater for a development of this magnitude. As an Important Open Space this land/site should be protected for village use. Only small scale development should be considered in Meppershall.</p>
Mr S Moore	<p>Would result in substantial greenfield development. Appropriate Brownfield sites are available within the village and should be developed prior to this site.</p> <p>Would be an obvious and significant intrusion into the open countryside, which is served by a number of nearby public footpaths.</p> <p>Council's comments to date do not support the proposed level of development. If the primary school does require an alternative site in the future this can be assessed at that time.</p> <p>The proposed access onto High Street is in close proximity to other junctions, with resulting adverse highway safety implications.</p>
Mr W Willis	<p>Development of this site in the manner detailed would surely turn this Large Village into a small town. Meppershall which once was a small village has already seen a massive increase in the number of new dwellings which is impacting upon the feel and spirit of the village. Like many other villagers I moved here to be away from the hustle and bustle of town life and to be closer to the countryside. Continuation of the expansion of villages on this sort of scale will undoubtedly result in their demise and with it the unique sense of community which exists therein.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H Arnold	This is far too large for the village and unfair on those of us who choose to live in a village this is taking away our countryside and although you say to provide a cemetery and doctors we have a very good doctors service in Shefford and those who can not get to the doctors in Shefford would not be able to get to the doctors in Meppershall it would also cause major traffic in the village and I believe would spoil the village.
R M Smith	<p>H174 may not be on a flood plain, but it is below the spring line (we had a well in our garden). Building on this hillside would also increase the risk of flash flooding in Campton and Shefford. Any development of this site should therefore be subject to a full hydrological survey.</p> <p>Access to the High Street would be the third T-junction in 50m, making a bad traffic situation even worse. For this reason alone H174 would be totally unsuitable for community facilities - school, village hall or cemetery (where a newly-dug grave could flood before the funeral took place!)</p> <p>Any significant development in Meppershall should be planned as a whole, contained within the area bounded by High Street, Fildyke Road, Chapel Road and Stondon Road, and at a density appropriate to a rural environment.</p>
Sarah Moxey	Takes too much green field - massive number of homes - too many boxes going up, adds nothing to a village.
Stephen Doe	The last development of this size has had significant impact in the village by way of congestion and petty crime this one would be no different. Developers never deliver the extras like GP surgery etc
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it!</p> <p>1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H189

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 Geneux	Totally inappropriate. How long before the village joins with Campton. Access onto a road with the National Speed Limit. No public transport. Further congestion at the busy high street Campton Road junction. More Farmland for housing why? This is about money making not for the good of the village.
Chris Worrell	This site is a long way from the centre of the village for elderly people. Traffic during construction of 35 homes would present problems in the village.
David Heath	There should be no further large developments as it would lose its village identity. Some anti-social behaviour has already been attributed to occupants on the so-called affordable/social housing and the possibility of more housing of this nature is NOT acceptable - particularly in view of the fact that our local community police officer has now been withdrawn. The High Street is now a very busy road with too many cars parked on it and the impact of this extra housing will place considerable extra strain on it.
David Turner	This site is unsuitable for development, being outside the village development envelope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is also close to an area of historical and archaeological importance (John Bunyan trail and motte and bailey of manor house and church) and this scale of the proposals are unacceptable for the village - Significant additional traffic and noise would also result - This is a very dangerous bend (Campton Road/High Street turn).
E Thompson	Winding narrow road down to Campton an increasing traffic hazard - near misses on bends often occur.
Elaine Travers	The top of the high street is already too congested with cars parked and traffic. The sharp bend from Rectory Road gives further problems to the flow of traffic in and out of the village. Given this site is proposed for elderly homes there is a significant issue for access and local transport.
J Gilbert	Congestion at the top of the village is already a problem and there is insufficient space to widen the road. Access via the winding road to Campton would be dangerous. Gregory Close was a hated, ugly and inappropriate addition the village. Integration with existing village has been problematic. 3 storey houses should be banned in villages.
J Parsons	Although this proposal contains the potential to limit further development pressure to the south towards the Church it still represents a large site with the potential to open further large parcels of land northwards to the west of the High Street to irresistible demands for development.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.

Submitted by	Comments
M Cross	This would inappropriately extend current village residential building limits down Campton Rd (site is currently a working farm site). A large development would also be completely out of character with the surrounding area. Infra-structure and environment/climate related points made in response to site ref. H034 would also be applicable.
Mr S Moore	<p>The site is in a prominent location, meaning any future development would be easily apparent and have a notable adverse impact upon the western entrance to the village. The suggestion of the promoters to introduce a landscape buffer, recognises this problem, but will be insufficient to address it.</p> <p>Existing buildings on site would in all likelihood need to be relocated elsewhere within the surrounding countryside, to enable the active agricultural use to continue, thereby further eroding the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The adjoining highway, onto which pedestrian and vehicle access will need to be taken, is a rural lane with nearby bends and is likely to result in highway danger for both pedestrians and vehicles using or passing the site. The introduction of required visibility splays may not be achievable and, even if possible, would detract from the rural character of the area.</p>
Mrs Sarah Lambley	<p>The proposed land is on a very dangerous bend, approaching from a blind hill, off a 60 mile zone.</p> <p>For residents in Church and Campton road, it is already un safe to cross from the high street. For another 60+ cars the area is not well lit and without footpaths on corners and bends.</p> <p>The site is far from any local amenities. Not on a bus route and will not encourage the use of public transport. Unsuitable for elderly and families. Parking is already a problem. This could encourage antisocial behaviour on farmland and near roads.</p> <p>This site is environmentally unfriendly, it will encourage noise and traffic pollution. The land forms part of a beautiful landscape from Campton, Gravenhurst and Shefford.</p> <p>To knock down farm buildings and replace with 30+ dwellings would be detrimental to our heritage.</p> <p>Construction work would be unsafe to residents and traffic at the end of the village.</p> <p>The school cannot accommodate an increase.</p> <p>This area has drainage and flooding problems.</p>
R. G. Boorman	Objects to building on agricultural land. This land, in all probability will be needed to grow food in the future as world population grows.
Stephen Doe	Again it is too large a development to avoid having a negative impact on village life.
Stuart Travers	Vehicle access to the site would be via a blind bend and cause potential danger to pedestrians and other road users. The site is near a complex junction and school which cause traffic congestion during the week. Public transport is limited to one bus per day. Given that this site is focused upon providing some homes for the elderly, it is difficult to believe that there will be adequate access to public transport. This development would not be in character with the rest of the village.

Submitted by	Comments
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools.2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already.3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H191

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
P. Gilbert	This would be a good site for sympathetic development within the existing building line along Shefford Road. Careful design should minimise traffic congestion problems. Development at this end of the village should be conditional on provision of a footpath to Shefford.
R M Smith	I would support H191 as logical in-filling without substantially increasing the village boundary.

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
Chris Worrell	Big impact on existing countryside? Traffic problems during construction? What about people living opposite?
J Gilbert	Maybe - if there really has to be more housing in Meppershall. There has been a vast amount of building in Meppershall over the last 5 years. Do we really need more here? If a "few" houses were to be built here, it would be less bad than other sites proposed in the village, as long as they are in keeping (no more than 2 storey) with current houses in the area.
M Cross	Comments to other village proposals may also apply. However, if needs must this could be a priority development possibility as it would fit into existing building lines and fill in vacant land running alongside the existing main road.
Stephen Doe	This is the only proposed development which if managed correctly could achieve it purpose with minimum impact on 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
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.
Mr & Mrs Bird	We moved out of a town (Stevenage) to make the best of our lives; fresh air, trouble free environment, fields, animals, crops and all the good things that you have in a village and now we find there is going to be a housing estate almost opposite! We do not want to live in a town, why cant they leave existing villages alone. If the area needs more housing then put them all in one area and make a new village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr P J Challinor	This is a green field site. Development of any kind at this location should be avoided if possible. The traffic generated by this proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the village of Meppershall. Furthermore this ribbon development along the main road would only serve to block out views of the surrounding countryside there by destroying the feeling of the rural setting of the village.
Mr S Moore	This greenfield sites provides an introduction to the open countryside as one leaves the village to the north. It provides attractive views to the west across open fields and towards woodland. Its development would result in a substantial and prominent infill that would significantly detract from the character of the village. It is not large enough to offer community facilities. The limited depth of the site would question whether it could be sensibly laid out to connect with Shefford Road at one access point, or whether multiple access points will be required, with the accompanying adverse impact on highway safety.
R Cooper-Keeble	The site is outside the main core of development in Meppershall where there is sporadic development along the road frontage. To develop this site would be an inappropriate infilling of an important gap which links the countryside to the village. Sites which can provide amenities for the village would be acceptable (as others that have been put forward).
Raymond Johnson	This land has good cover for wildlife (birds) and a good length of hedgerow bordering Shefford Road. It has no footway on this side of Shefford road and I think that a footway on this side extending from the high street down to Shefford is going to be essential considering the increasing traffic volume, excess speeds in the 30MPH area and curvature of the road. Putting a footway here would destroy the above mentioned hedgerow. It's a poor choice for development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H249

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
P. Gilbert	The existing development at Gregory Close is such a planning disaster that it is hard to see how adding another 15 houses can make matters any worse. There should however be NO MORE 3 STOREY HOUSES in this or any other new building.
R M Smith	I would support H249 as logical in-filling. However, the site could be greatly expanded to create a new centre of gravity in the village. If there must be significant development, this is the place for it: between the footpath and the trackway onto Stondon Road, and from there up to the allotments, effectively extending the Bovis site. The additional space should be used to keep the density low.

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
M Cross	Not a desirable priority, but with the Coneygate development having proceeded with only limited support from village residents than this would be little more than an extension to the previous blot. Certainly a higher priority site for consideration than many others suggested within the village.
Mrs H Arnold	If you have seen parking and congestion at this particular end of Coneygate you will know that development of a further 15 dwellings will cause more problems. I am glad I don't live at that end of the road.

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
Chris Worrell	15 more dwellings here would only add to the disaster of the recent Bovis development & would impact upon existing countryside.
J Parsons	This site stands on the extreme edge of the village and due to its elevation will be highly visible. The area is also beginning to become valuable to wildlife.
J West	The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any significant increases. Lower school has had new classroom added but is still well subscribed if not full. Doctors are in Shefford or Stondon. Buses are available but times and routes are poor. Traffic has increased and speeding is an issue. Density of housing and multiple car ownership causes parking and road traffic problems.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr S Moore	<p>The extension of built development into open countryside would be easily apparent from adjacent public footpaths, detracting from the character of this part of the village.</p> <p>An existing TPO across all of the site appears very likely to restrict development potential.</p> <p>Access arrangements are not clear, but could potentially have adverse impact upon amenity space provision and amenity levels of adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>The site is not large enough to provide community facilities.</p> <p>If development of the site was appropriate, it would have been included within previous Coneygate development.</p>
Mrs Liz Taylor	<p>I think this site is wrong for development as access to the site is poor. The access to Gregory Close which leads to Coneygate from the High St in Meppershall gets very busy especially at school times. I do feel that that the proposed development of a further 15 houses would have a severe impact on the existing residents of this small cul-de-sac and is not in the best interest of the village.</p>
Robin Milner	<p>There is no access to this site. The only way in to this sight would be through my driveway. With the ever increasing amount of houses being placed in and around Meppershall and Shefford. For instant the houses being built over by the industrial estate in Shefford, Wixams project over the old Elstow storage depot and the Cranfield University site in Silsoe. I am unhappy in the way Meppershall is being treated. There is no need to build on Meppershall at this point in time. There are so many houses being developed at this point in time. Please do not build over this land!</p>
Sandra Bowden	<p>I strongly object to this site being used to build more housing. The proposed site entrance would obstruct passage to the current properties parking and front entrance which would include my home. I object to the disruption to the area, volume of traffic, during the building and on completion. I have often seen bats, owls and other wildlife in this area; whereas most land is farmed this land is a haven for creatures. There is very little public transport to support families, most families have more than one car per house hold, traffic would increase and the potential for accidents and pollution would increase. There is one small lower school in Meppershall, I would question if the school would be able to accommodate the growth in families moving to the area. Most of all I object to the noise and disruption a new build would cause in this area and my home.</p>
Stephen Doe	<p>On the plans for Bovis estate this was identified as public green space and it should actually made that. Rather than it currently is which is being left until the planners give in and allow development.</p>
T. McMairn	<p>No infrastructure to support these developments. No extra patients can get into local surgeries. New roads needed!! Public transport links are non-existent at present. Traffic is already overcrowded! It will destroy countryside - what's left of it!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lack of local doctors, dentists and schools. 2) Extra traffic in an already crowded system = we have one way streets due to parking by so many extra cars, especially 9am, 3.30pm and 6pm already. 3) Petty local vandalism has increased.

Submitted by	Comments
Wendy Rust	I am astounded that as a Meppershall resident for 5 years, paying council tax in excess of £2,000 p.a. the first I hear of planned development is in the local press. This is tangible proof that Mid Beds Council views Meppershall residents as nothing more than a revenue generating population. Meppershall is already struggling in terms of infrastructure without expansion - there is currently an inadequate infrastructure, public transport services and local amenities. This particular site is currently used by walkers and is home to numerous wildlife species - surely it would be better for Mid Beds to consider redevelopment of existing run-down areas elsewhere in the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H315

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 Charles Grundy	Our initial concern would be how close any proposed new houses would encroach on our property, particularly as we have a rather narrow rear garden. We also feel that the village school, roads and mains services are not capable of supporting the extra capacity that will be placed upon them, i.e. more children, more cars and increased pressure on the sewage system.
Mr Philip Challinor	Development of this site would cause excessive congestion and traffic problems to an already dangerous village road. I believe that Meppershall has been fully/over developed already and would not benefit from this size of development.
Mr R Kovacs	Absolutely disgusting that some of the land behind Orchard Close was offered to adjoining properties at a hugely inflated price with a proviso that the rest of the field would be planted to orchard. Meppershall has had more than its fair share of problems with so called "social" housing tenants, more like "anti-social housing". Meppershall Lower School is at or near capacity already and traffic through the village is already a problem especially at rush hour with the village being used as a rat run from the A507.
Mr Robert Eagles	Site floods on a regular basis Storm Drains are always overwhelmed in this part of the village The local family should be allowed to continue to "Farm the Land". Proposed development would lead to increased crime & anti-social behaviour as did development at the other end of the High Street. Security would be compromised at properties in Orchard Close. Development would change the entire ethos of this part of the Village
Mr Robin Martin	Will have an effect on the properties in Orchard Close that border the land.1. The view from the rear gardens over fields will disappear.2. The rear of the properties will be overlooked.3. As a result of 1 and 2. will affect the value of the properties in Orchard Close.4. Depending on access route and density of housing there will be an effect on the traffic volume.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Mark Thomason	<p>Reasons for objection Lack of access to the site – currently no access is available to the proposed site; the only possible method of creating access is by the removal of two substantial properties. Both these properties are in perfectly good condition and are in keeping with the rest of the village. Surely the removal of the properties would be in contravention of current planning policy. Major impact to surrounding property – Like others that live in Orchard Close, my property backs onto the proposed site. This proposed development would have a major impact on not just my property but all my neighbours’ properties. Justification: One of the major factors for purchasing this property was for the view over farmland and not been over looked by other housing, as such we paid a premium at the time to obtain such a property in a village with views. Very recently we asked a local estate agent to value our property, one of the major factors related to the value of our property was the fact that we had a views over countryside and the house was not over looked – they stated this could effect the price by approx 15%. The current views would also make the property far more desirable over other similar properties in the area. Local Area. This kind of development did not appear on the Meppershall plan for good reason. Not only would such a development cause significant increase in traffic to what is already a busy main road, but this kind of development does not have the local infrastructure to support it. AdditionalThe two people submitting this plan clearly do not have the best interests of the village in their thinking. I would suggest that they have seen the recently published Meppershall plan and now personal greed has taken over, why else would you be willing to upset all your local neighbours whilst also having your own house demolished? Like others in Orchard Close I have recently purchased part of the field from one of the applicants after he approached me to do so. At that time i asked the representative of the applicant what the plans were for the rest of the field, they stated very clearly to not only myself but also all my neighbours that they wanted to preserve the field and prevent any kind of development in the future – this was clearly a lie and proves how distrustful this person is and clearly shows that they have no consideration to the future of the village.</p>
Mr Scott Moore	<p>Development of the site would represent unnecessary loss of agricultural land and should only be considered after previously developed sites in Meppershall have been allocated. Would represent an obvious expansion into open countryside when approaching the village from the north east and as a result detract from the character and appearance of Meppershall and the surrounding countryside.</p>
Mr Stephen Turner	<p>I disagree with any future development in Meppershall until the village is provided with much better amenities, i.e. New village hall /Community centre, Playing fields, Better public transport, footpaths in and out of the village.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Diane Dellar	<p>I am a resident of orchard close and have been for 21 years. I was horrified to learn of the planning application for 30/32 Shefford Road, directly affecting me and all the other residents of orchard close whose houses back onto the field in question. I personally have made all the said residents aware of this potential planning application. Has you are aware that the owner at 30 Shefford Road has offered for sale 30ft of the field to residents of Orchard Close. We have not brought ours yet, but when speaking to the agent acting for the owner of this land I asked him what would happen to the rest of the field told me quite specifically that the field was going to be laid to Orchard. Obviously a blatant lie. I also contacted your planning dept a couple of years after a rumour to find out whether there was going to be any building work. I was told that because this was what was called an envelope field this was highly unlikely. Your very words. Due to the other building work proposed in the village, and to keep Meppershall a village and not a small town these houses are not needed or wanted. The only people who will benefit from this are the owners of 30/32 Shefford Road and obviously financially. If I had wanted to live in a build up housing estate I expect I would have chosen this some 21 years ago. Instead I choose this house because of the outlook. I expect you will be hearing from the other residents in due course. I therefore strongly object to this planning application.</p>
Mrs Lynne Catherine Bew	<p>Mr Cady who owns this land recently sold us a small piece of land to extend our garden at a cost of £7000 and assured us that the rest of the land would only be used for agricultural purposes or for him to extend his own garden, and not be sold at a great profit for building houses. When applying for planning permission to change our use from agricultural to garden we were again assured that the council would not grant permission for housing on this land. Finally the issue of school capacity and costs to provide a school has not been addressed also the problems of increased transport onto the narrow Shefford Road.</p>
Mrs Penelope Hilton	<p>This proposal was not part of the first submissions so was not given the opportunity for consultation as part of the Meppershall Village Plan. It is outside the Settlement envelope of the village and although not on a flood plain will have a significant risk of creating flooding as even with current housing in Orchard Close the land at the junction with Hoo Road already floods. The submission states congestion would not be a problem as the access is on the outskirts of the village however the proposed access is off the main village street - Shefford Road which already has significant traffic problems. The recent installation of a traffic calming sign very close to the proposed access proves this is a traffic black spot. In addition Mr Cady who owns adjacent land and has also submitted plans for development recently sold to us and our neighbours a very small parcel of land (30 foot by 40 foot)at £7000, a premium price for agricultural land, on the understanding that he would not be submitting any plans for development. When we requested advice on change of use from agricultural land to residential land from the planning office at Chicksands it was on the clear understanding that the council would not grant permission for any future development on these plots. Finally the issue of Middle school capacity and increased transport and cost to provide schools for children is also not addressed by this development.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H318

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 Mark Thomason	<p>Reasons for objection Lack of access to the site – currently no access is available to the proposed site; the only possible method of creating access is by the removal of two substantial properties. Both these properties are in perfectly good condition and are in keeping with the rest of the village. Surely the removal of the properties would be in contravention of current planning policy. Major impact to surrounding property – Like others that live in Orchard Close, my property backs onto the proposed site. This proposed development would have a major impact on not just my property but all my neighbours’ properties. Justification: One of the major factors for purchasing this property was for the view over farmland and not been over looked by other housing, as such we paid a premium at the time to obtain such a property in a village with views. Very recently we asked a local estate agent to value our property, one of the major factors related to the value of our property was the fact that we had views over the countryside and the house was not over looked – they stated this could effect the price by approx 15%. The current views would also make the property far more desirable over other similar properties in the area. Local Area This kind of development did not appear on the Meppershall plan for good reason. Not only would such a development cause significant increase in traffic to what is already a busy main road, but this kind of development does not have the local infrastructure to support it. Additional The two people submitting this plan clearly do not have the best interests of the village in their thinking. I would suggest that they have seen the recently published Meppershall plan and now personal greed has taken over; why else would you be willing to upset all your local neighbours whilst also having your own house demolished? Like others in Orchard Close I have recently purchased part of the field from one of the applicants after he approached me to do so. At that time I asked the representative of the applicant what the plans were for the rest of the field, they stated very clearly to not only myself but also all my neighbours that they wanted to preserve the field and prevent any kind of development in the future – this was clearly a lie and proves how distrustful this person is and clearly shows that they have no consideration to the future of the village.</p>
Mr Philip Challinor	<p>Development of this site would cause excessive congestion and traffic problems to an already dangerous village road. I believe that Meppershall has been fully/over developed already and would not benefit from this size of development.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Robert Eagles	Flooding is a major problem on this proposed site Will affect the "quality of life" of the residents who boarder proposed site. RAF Henlow (Pilot Training) will be affected by restricting their flight-paths property owners at the other end of the Village object to aircraft flying over them and have made restrictions upon the Training Wing. The site owner sold small parts of this land to enable homeowners to enlarge their gardens (at a very high price) telling them that rest of the field would NOT be developed, albeit a paddock would form the centre of the site. Police cannot protect the residents of the Village against crime & anti-social behaviour now, we don't want a repeat of the problems that became apparent when the "Taylors" site was developed and the issues still ongoing.
Mr Robert Kovacs	Disgusting that small parcels of land were offered at hugely inflated price to the neighbouring residences with the proviso that the remaining land was to be planted to orchard. Already problems in the village with so called "social housing" tenants. Small village school already at or near to capacity. Traffic already a problem especially during the rush hours when the village is used as a rat run to & from the A507.
Mr Scott Moore	Due to the agricultural / green field nature of the site, it should only be considered for development following the allocation of all appropriate previously developed sites in Meppershall. The sites location means that its development will represent an obvious intrusion into the open countryside. This will have a detrimental impact upon the appearance and character of the village and surrounding countryside when approaching from the north east in particular.
Mr Stephen Turner	I disagree with any future development in Meppershall until the village is provided with much better amenities, i.e. New village hall /Community centre, Playing fields, Better public transport, footpaths in and out of the village.
Mrs Penelope Hilton	This proposal was not part of the first submissions so was not given the opportunity for consultation as part of the Meppershall Village Plan. It is outside the Settlement envelope of the village and although not on a flood plain will have a significant risk of creating flooding as even with current housing in Orchard Close the land at the junction with Hoo Road already floods. The submission states congestion would not be a problem as the access is on the outskirts of the village however the proposed access is off the main village street - Shefford Road which already has significant traffic problems. The recent installation of a traffic calming sign very close to the proposed access proves this is a traffic blackspot. Access from Hoo Road as proposed is not possible for vehicles as this part of Hoo Road is a single track which is not traffic worthy. In addition Mr Cady who owns this land recently sold to us and our neighbours a very small parcel of land (30 foot by 40 foot) at £7000, a premium price for agricultural land, on the understanding that he would not be submitting any plans for development. When we requested advice on change of use from agricultural land to residential land from the planning office at Chicksands it was on the clear understanding that the council would not grant permission for any future development on these plots. I have a copy of this planning guidance from you which I sought in advance of buying the small parcel of garden if you wish to see a copy. Finally the issue of Middle school capacity and increased transport and cost to provide schools for children is also not addressed by this development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H327**

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	Campton has hardly any local services (in particular no shop or post office) and the site is some distance from Meppershall village. A development of the size proposed is totally unsuitable for the location: indeed, no development here can be sustainable. This site should be swiftly rejected.
Mr Neil Francis	Local schools, doctors are all oversubscribed without any further development.

Ref Number: H352

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Scott Moore	From the submitted documents proposing this site, it appears that the development would be entirely dependant upon being associated with the substantial proposed allocation to the north (H174). Submissions have been made separately setting out why H174 should not be allocated. Without being linked with H174 the site cannot be accessed. On its own it is not large enough to notably contribute towards affordable housing or local infrastructure.

MEPPERSHALL APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Robin Sandler	Meppershall	<p>I am writing to you with concern to the proposed building work re: land at The Mow, Hoo Road, Meppershall. I have read all the literature available to me, concerning this matter, and would like to express my disgust at the thought of more building work taking place ruining the views from my property. I have already had to watch new houses being built in Fildyke Road at the top of the meadow belonging to The Mow. Now I am expected to be compliant with extensive building works taking place right outside my front door. I purchased 49 Hoo Road in 2003 because it was situated on the edge of the village and with rural aspects. As it borders the nature reserve, it would be of benefit to the local community for the council to adopt the meadow belonging to The Mow as part of the Old Road Meadow nature reserve. I am totally opposed to any building work taking place opposite my property. Robin Sandler.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Andrew Garratt	Meppershall	<p>Dear Chris, I have been looking at details of the Hoo Road, Meppershall site which has been put forward for a potential site for residential development. I live in one of the cottages that would be severely affected by any development on that site, and feel that there are a number of reasons why this should not be built on. As I understand it, the plans locally are to provide housing and jobs. Meppershall is a village with few amenities and public transport is very infrequent and inadequate for anybody that is employed outside of the village and without their own transport. Planning guidelines generally require good public transport links to reduce the need for private transport. There are very few jobs within the village itself. The access to the site through Hoo road will cause extreme problems. It is overloaded at present as vehicles are parked on one side of the road most of the way down and it is only two cars wide. Additional traffic will cause severe problems and the road is not of the quality to allow traffic and the emergency services safe access, and there is certainly not room for construction traffic. The bottom end of the road in front of the cottages is a public bridleway and if this is replaced with a tarmac road through to the access road, this will be out of character with the area. Next to the site is currently a nature reserve. This is used widely by villagers for safe, quiet walks with their families. It has picnic tables and is well used when the weather is nice. Whilst this amenity will still be there, the safety aspect will disappear because of the additional cars on the road leading to it, and also will certainly no longer be peaceful. I also have concerns about the watercourse. Any further development is likely to cause less ground soak and may cause flooding at the bottom of Hoo Road, the realigned section on the plan will just move this further down the road. I have lived in Meppershall for many years and purchased my own home 2 years ago. I chose the location of my home because it is very rural; it has already been spoilt by the large development currently under construction at the rear end of the proposed site. No consideration has been given to the row of cottages that have stood there for over 100 years. They have no frontage and are right on the bridleway. If a tarmac road is put in, presumably they will then be right on the road, and there does not seem to have been any arrangements made for parking for the residents of the cottages. In sum up, I feel this development will make the area over developed and out of keeping with the character of the village. It will cause severe traffic problems and will affect the lives of all of the villagers who use the amenities of the nature reserve. There are surely other sites that can be built on that will not cause these problems. Regards Andrew Garratt.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Christine Elbourne	Meppershall	<p>I have considered all the proposed sites and have to admit that two border my garden. The Shillington road site, Church View Nurseries is for an unspecified number of houses which I find disturbing. The site access is terrible and dangerous. Getting out of our own drive is not easy and that is closer to the corner where traffic is slower. The Stondon Road nursery site will be the highest point in the village and ruin the skyline and surely cut into the green belt area. If there has to be development in the village then new facilities will be needed. The school has already been extended and lost its swimming pool in the process. The village hall is in a bad state of repair and as the chapel is soon to be closed there is no other large meeting place in the village. Therefore the logical solution to me is to allow the land behind the Village Hall and the High Street to be developed to include provision for a school, playgrounds and village hall and thereby provide the facilities which currently are not large enough to withstand further development. It would appear that if you let your greenhouses become neglected then they are a Brownfield site and more likely to get planning permission. Is this not a discouragement for owners to utilise their greenhouses as profitably as possible?</p> <p>It would appear that if you let your greenhouses become neglected then they are a Brownfield site and more likely to get planning permission. Is this not a discouragement for owners to utilise their greenhouses as profitably as possible?</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Louise J Stinson (Mrs)	Meppershall	<p>I thought I would send a copy of my comments for your consultation process from my email account as well as from the website. I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the submission of the above land as a potential housing site. For clarity, I have referred all my comments to points raised in the appraisal statement, produced by Woods Hardwick Planning Ltd, dated Feb 2007. Appraisal statement Site Character; relationship to adjacent land users. 2.1 'To the north is an existing terrace of properties on the opposite side of Hoo Road which are sited immediately on the back edge of the highway.' These are ten terraced cottages, dating from approximately the 1880s, stretched along an unpaved bridleway, about three metres wide, with a brook on the opposite side. There is limited vehicular access due to the nature of the bridleway. 2.5 The mature planting mentioned would have to be dug up if the nature of the bridleway and course of the brook was to be altered. This would mean the cottages would not be overlooking a field, but an unrestricted view of the proposed housing estate. The existing access mentioned is to the one dwelling on the land, 'The Mow', the two bedroom bungalow, set back from the bridleway. It is limited access, using the bridleway, not a public highway. 2.9 The access point is over the brook, which flows along the entire length of the bridleway. It has mature trees and shrubs along its length, with all the associated wildlife. This is the planting that would have to be removed should the access route shown in the document be implemented. 2.10 The bungalow 'The Mow' is currently occupied, not vacant as described. It has been occupied by a family for at least the last 8 months, after renovation by the owners from approximately November 2006 onwards. Previously, it had been occupied by various tenants from at least May 2001. The property is maintained to a high standard. Appraisal Statement Development Constraints 3.2 '... providing a suitable access to the site will not be a problem.' I disagree wholeheartedly with this comment. Access would significantly detrimentally impact the cottages on Hoo Road, as well as the other houses on Hoo Road. The road traffic would increase hugely. It would alter the condition and nature of the road. The environment would be impacted by the loss of hedgerow and mature trees. It would make a previously quiet safe bridleway, which is suitable for all, a hazardous thoroughfare. It is currently a no-through unpaved bridleway, unsuitable for vehicles. 3.4 Services and utilities.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Louise J Stinson (Mrs) [continued]	Meppershall	Over recent years, due to development within the village, and the nature of Hoo Road and the bridleway, drainage has become a recurrent problem. The rainwater runoff flows down Hoo Road, into the brook, but also effects the drains running behind the cottages. There would need to be substantive development to the current drainage system of the cottages before the housing estate could be built. 3.10 The development would have an acceptable impact upon the amenities of the terraced cottages along the bridleway. These are my initial comments regarding the proposed development on 'The Mow' on Hoo Road, Meppershall. I would appreciate a receipt that this email has been received and noted. Please contact me with any comments or questions regarding this email. Many thanks and kind regards Louise J Stinson (Mrs).

Name	Subject	Comment
Martin and Karen Bates Beaufort	Meppershall H034, H035, H189	<p>Comments re Land Proposed for Development in Meppershall, specifically: H034 Bury Nurseries, 100 High Street, Meppershall 55 Dwellings H035 Land r/o 82 High Street and Beaumaris, Long Acre 7-10 Dwellings H189 Land at Bury Farm, Meppershall 35 Dwellings We write to comment on the sites submitted for potential development in Meppershall, but specifically the adjoining sites listed above.</p> <p>Site Character § It is suggested that these sites provide the potential for a total of 100 new homes. This alone makes up 25% of the required provision for 400 new homes throughout the 39 Large and Small Villages in Mid Bedfordshire in itself a very unfair statistic! § A development of this size could potentially generate an average of 2 cars per household. Access to these sites is unsuitable from either Campton Road, with its proximity to the difficult junction with the High Street, or especially 100 High Street, with its close proximity to the school and Rogers Bakery. At peak school times, due to parking, the High Street is effectively a hazardous one way road from beyond Taylors Close to the blind bend where the High Street becomes Rectory Road at the junction with Campton Road. § If H035 is viewed as a standalone proposal, the narrow driveway to the side of the semi-detached property 82 High Street is unsuitable for access to the site. It has yet to be adopted as an official driveway for the existing property. Viewing would be restricted if turning left from the site onto the High Street due to the neighbouring properties mature conifer screening. In addition, the bus stop for Middle and Upper School pupils is located just to the left of this proposed access and a significant number of pupils congregate here to wait for their transport. § Bury Farm is a modern working farm in a rural location, the character of which compliments the adjacent conservation area. The same cannot be said for a large scale housing development. Sustainability Issues § Large scale housing development in a rural village inherently brings with it a large increase in the volume of traffic passing through it. Although Meppershall lies in close proximity to major roads such as the A507/A6/A1, Meppershall itself is not accessed by good roads. All roads leading to/from/through the village are hazardous in places or have restrictions e.g. single width carriageway either due to parked cars or the physical width of the road, lack of pedestrian footpaths, blind bends, dangerous junctions etc. § Recent large scale development in the catchment areas of the schools served by the village, have meant that Middle Schools especially have reached capacity.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
<p>Martin and Karen Bates Beaufort [continued]</p>	<p>Meppershall H034, H035, H189</p>	<p>Samuel Whitbread Community College is already a very large Upper School and surely cannot continue to expand indefinitely to meet demand? Meppershall Lower School has already had an extension, to ease accommodating the increased numbers of pupils generated from the recent Bovis development in Meppershall of some 75 homes. § Bus Services to and from Meppershall are infrequent and not well supported. The reality of modern village life is that a car is a necessity for most residents, unfortunately adding to their carbon footprint, rather than reducing it! § Car parking at the nearest railway station, Arlesey, is already inadequate for the volume of commuters currently using the station each day. A similar situation exists at Hitchin station. Development Constraints § All the above proposals fall outside the current boundary of the Mid Beds Local Plan (First Review: Adopted December 2005). § Meppershall has already experienced its fair share of large scale housing development in the last 5 years, increasing the total population by around 20% and impacting significantly on local services. § The recent Bovis development to the east of the High Street was widely opposed by village residents. Another development of a similar size and type as proposed by Bury Nurseries within such a short space of time would meet very strong opposition. § Can the local infrastructure for essential services such as water, sewage, electric, gas, telephones etc continue to cope with an ever increasing demand? Development Opportunities § Profits for individual landowners at the expense of the residents of Meppershall! We hope that Mid Beds Council will exercise caution when considering their preferred sites from the large volume put forward. By distributing the requirement for the provision of 400 new homes across all of Mid Bedfordshire's 39 Large and Small Villages, the impact of any new development on individual villages could potentially be minimised. Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. In this context sustainable development is surely about encouraging local business and communities to produce local employment opportunities for local people to meet local needs, not simply turning to housing development in order to sustain the use of land. Yours sincerely Martin and Karen Bates Beaufort,</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Pat Williams	H327, Meppershall (Campton)	<p>Thank you for your speedy and comprehensive reply. I would like the committee to consider the following points:- Over the last decade Campton Parish has almost doubled in size. Housing on Chicksands former military base being sold off to the public, this has increased the number of properties from 200 to 350. The proposed site would create almost 50% increase in properties of Campton Village, Causing over development. During this increase in residents over the last few years the village has received no extra infrastructure (schools, sewage improvements, etc.) My main objection to this development are as follows:- The current infrastructure would not be able to support the extra properties (the school already has to rely on mobile buildings). The road (which is a narrow country road) would not be able to support the extra traffic. There is no footpath from the site into the village (so pedestrians including school children would have walk along the road). The road cannot be widened as it is restricted by the width of the bridge. Most of the traffic would come through the village of Campton (which already has to cope with large lorries from the Hanlon site on the Gravenhurst Road). Although the site is in the Parish of Meppershall (which would receive the portion of Council Tax), because of it's vicinity to Campton, it would be Campton and Chicksands Parish that would be providing any facilities and have the inconvenience of the extra traffic.) The only facilities in the village are one public house (which does not provide food) and a church, there are no shops, therefore all shopping will have to be done by car causing greater stress on village roads. The river at that area has flooded quite recently see http://www.camptonandchicksands.org.uk/images2.htm. Extra housing and hard surfaces in this area would precipitate this. The impact on the rural aspect, picturesque valley would be immense. I therefore feel that this an a wholly inappropriate site for development.</p>
Jackie Bond	Round two sites	<p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity of commenting on the 3 new sites in Meppershall for proposed housing. Whilst I do not believe these 3 new sites would affect me personally, unlike those for the nurseries along and behind Stondon road, I still have the same concerns about increases in traffic volumes along the high street of the 2 proposed sites in the village. There has already been a noticeable increase in traffic volumes, and the quality and speed of traffic in the village, following the large development at Taylors close and I fear that further development in the heart of the village would exacerbate this problem.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Godfrey Knock	H315 & H318, Meppershall	<p>Following our telephone conversation today I have several concerns over the proposed development behind 30 and 32 Shefford Road Meppershall Beds SG17 5LN.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to site 2. Distance from entrance to new development of our property 3. Current High levels of traffic along a minor road 4. Increased traffic 5. Increased Noise and disturbance 6. Loss of current countryside 7. Loss of views and peace. <p>Increased pressure on local services, e.g. GP, Police etc I have spoken to our neighbours and it is clear we had no idea of these proposals; we feel strongly about this issue and would like more direct forms of consultation to be used. Talk to us directly we would like to be involved</p>