

RIDGMONT 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.

RIDGMONT APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H107

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
Craig Murfitt	This is a village in the countryside, if we wanted to live in an urban sprawl we would move to an unsightly town.
Daniel Heginbotham	<p>The services in the village cannot support such a development and would create congestion at the junction with the new bypass as well as extra traffic going through Woburn, Husband Crawley and Woburn Sands.</p> <p>Local doctors and dentists are already not coping with the residents already in the area. From a traffic point of view the extra traffic to go where the jobs are namely Milton Keynes would further cause delays along the A421 which is a nightmare at the moment anyway.</p> <p>Ridgmont is a lovely village please dont spoil it!</p>
Graham White	The development on this site is outside the village envelope, is in the Greenbelt and within a conservation area.
John Hilton	Would affect open views from public footpaths in the Green belt. Access from the A507 poor and would be from one end of the site giving a poor development form. I strongly oppose this site.
Kate Nelson	<p>This site is greenbelt and a beautiful stretch of open countryside, totally inappropriate for a housing development. The number of houses is inconsistent with the parish plan. It will hinder the natural enjoyment of our property ~& blight all properties on Church St Segenhoe Close + Segenhoe Manor Road.</p> <p>This site is outside the development boundary of the village and will impact severely on nearby properties, hindering the material enjoyment of the property and blighting a beautiful stretch of open countryside with unnecessary over development of a small village.</p>
Mary Goulder	<p>We should not be building on green belt land , especially that which has been deemed of great value. Ridgmont has suffered the trials of waiting for a bypass, it should now be left to be what it once was, a small village that can cope with the limitations of infrastructure.</p> <p>Once we give in to those who seek to make changes from a primarily profit viewpoint we have only ourselves to blame for the mess we leave to our descendants.</p>
Michael G Nelson	1- Application H108 refers to possible access from Church Street, this is a private road owned by 4 occupiers and Woburn Estates all of which object to the proposal. 2- All the proposals are within a defined greenbelt and either in or adjacent to a conservation area and outside the village boundary. 3- Local plan permits no more than 2 dwellings to be grouped together. 4- Additional traffic will severely burden A507 which has just been bypassed. 5- Our visual amenity will be completely lost which we do not want to lose.
Michael Knights	Spoil the village green belt.
Mike Gill	This is green belt - no housing should be permitted whatsoever. If anywhere is to be built upon, it should be as infill between the new bypass and the M1.

Submitted by	Comments
Mike Nelson	<p>I personally and the vast majority of the village strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>Ridgmont is within a defined green belt and as such no development should be permitted.</p> <p>Our visual amenity will be completely obscured by the proposed development, furthermore access to the site is not possible due to private (unclassified) roads. We fear that the current value of our homes will suffer due to the proposed development and the mere knowledge of such a proposal will stifle the sale of properties that are currently being marketed.</p> <p>The increased traffic will cause a burden on the village which after many years is just started to enjoy the benefit of the new bypass.</p>
Mr/Mrs M Brinklow	<p>Whilst feeling sympathetic to the business in Ridgmont we have to realise that undoubtedly the residents of the village will in the main be opposed to the proposed development. Ridgmont is unique and after campaigning for over 20 years for the long awaited bypass, the last thing we need is for our wonderful green belt habitat to be spoiled by such a development. Most of the alternative sites are surely more suitable given the conservation we are in. Let the residents of Ridgmont have their say and please listen to their point of view. We do not want to lose what is considered to be an area of outstanding natural beauty. Please come and see for yourself.</p>
Mrs M J Bines	<p>Infrastructure for development of these sites does not exist. This land is all green belt - should never be considered for any future development.</p>
P Knights	<p>Do not build on Greenbelt</p>
R V Bridges	<p>Greenbelt is Greenbelt. Moving the goal posts for avaricious reasons is not the solution. Is it correct that the owner of the land is on the parish council???</p>
Susan Hilton	<p>I strongly oppose the consideration of this site for future development. It is within the Green Belt and as such should be rejected.</p>
Susan White	<p>If housing development were permitted in any area of the green belt/area of great landscape value around Ridgmont it would set the precedent for other similar areas to be developed also. There is a danger of the village losing its character if building is allowed outside the current village area.</p>

Ref Number: H108

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
Craig Murfitt	This a village in the countryside, this type of development will kill the village and the village atmosphere.
Daniel Heginbotham	<p>The services in the village cannot support such a development and would create congestion at the junction with the new bypass as well as extra traffic going through Woburn, Husband Crawley and Woburn Sands.</p> <p>Local doctors and dentists are already not coping with the residents already in the area. From a traffic point of view the extra traffic to go where the jobs are namely Milton Keynes would further cause delays along the A421 which is a nightmare at the moment anyway.</p> <p>Ridgmont is a lovely village please don't spoil it!</p>
Graham White	The development on this site is outside the village envelope, is in the Greenbelt and within a conservation area. Development of this site would also encourage development of the site adjacent to it. i.e. H109 which in turn would encourage development of land on the opposite of Eversholt Road and development on that scale would be out of proportion with the existing village.
Jackie Biddiscombe	There is no need for further private housing in Ridgmont. The proposals would more then double the dwellings in Ridgmont - we are only just beginning to enjoy the peace and quiet in the village due to the opening of the by-pass, more housing would give more cars in and out of the village.
John Hilton	This site pushes a line of development into the Green belt. It would be a ribbon development and would create an undesirable intrusion into the open countryside. The development would convert a well used and popular public footpath through open countryside into an access Road for a new housing development. The development of this site would have a prejudicial effect on the Green Belt and make additional development in the vicinity likely in the future. The site has insufficient space for the suggested village hall without utilising additional Green Belt land.
Kate Nelson	<p>This site is greenbelt & open countryside & outside the development boundary of the village. It will blight all properties on Church St, Seguhoe Manor Road & Seguhoe Close & hides the enjoyment of our home.</p> <p>This site is outside the development boundary of the village and will impact severely on nearby properties, hindering the material enjoyment of the property and blighting a beautiful stretch of open countryside with unnecessary over development of a small village</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Michael G Nelson	1- Application H108 refers to possible access from Church Street, this is a private road owned by 4 occupiers and Woburn Estates all of which object to the proposal. 2- All the proposals are within a defined greenbelt and either in or adjacent to a conservation area and outside the village boundary. 3- Local plan permits no more than 2 dwellings to be grouped together. 4- Additional traffic will severely burden A507 which has just been bypassed. 5- Our visual amenity will be completely lost which we do not want to lose.
Michael Knights	Mad and crazy idea to spoil the village and walks around green belt area.
Mike Gill	Do not develop the green belt.
Mike Nelson	<p>I personally and the vast majority of the village strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>Ridgmont is within a defined green belt and as such no development should be permitted.</p> <p>Our visual amenity will be completely obscured by the proposed development, furthermore access to the site is not possible due to private (unclassified) roads. We fear that the current value of our homes will suffer due to the proposed development and the mere knowledge of such a proposal will stifle the sale of properties that are currently being marketed.</p> <p>The increased traffic will cause a burden on the village which after many years is just started to enjoy the benefit of the new bypass.</p>
Mrs M J Bines	Infrastructure for development of these sites does not exist. This land is all green belt - should never be considered for any future development.
P Knights	Do not build on greenbelt.
R V Bridges	Greenbelt is Greenbelt. Moving the goal posts for avaricious reasons is not the solution. Is it correct that the owner of the land is on the parish council???
Susan Hilton	I strongly oppose any development on this site. It is within the Green Belt, it is outside the village envelope and would alter the village boundary-creating a dangerous precedent.
Susan White	If housing development were permitted in any area of the green belt/area of great landscape value around Ridgmont it would set the precedent for other similar areas to be developed also. There is a danger of the village losing its character if building is allowed outside the current village area.

Ref Number: H109

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
Craig Murfitt	This is a village in the countryside, the view across to the old church is nice especially with a sunset, filling the space will ruin this and turn it into an urban sprawl.
Daniel Heginbotham	The services in the village cannot support such a development and would create congestion at the junction with the new bypass as well as extra traffic going through Woburn, Husband Crawley and Woburn Sands. Local doctors and dentists are already not coping with the residents already in the area. From a traffic point of view the extra traffic to go where the jobs are namely Milton Keynes would further cause delays along the A421 which is a nightmare at the moment anyway. Ridgmont is a lovely village please don't spoil it!
Graham White	The development on this site is outside the village envelope, is in the Greenbelt and within a conservation area. Development of this site would also encourage development of land on the opposite of Eversholt Road and development on that scale would be out of proportion with the existing village.
Jackie Biddiscombe	There is no need for further private housing in Ridgmont. The proposals would more than double the dwellings in Ridgmont - we are only just beginning to enjoy the peace and quiet in the village due to the opening of the by-pass, more housing would give more cars in and out of the village.
John Hilton	This site is a flagrant breach of the Green Belt and is separated from the village by an open field. Its development would create a large infill site for as many dwellings again. A development of this scale would dominate and totally change the character of the village. The development would totally change the open country character of the local public footpath network. There is no way that this site can be deemed acceptable.
Kate Nelson	This site is greenbelt and open countryside & outside the development boundary of the village. It will blight existing properties, open country views on Evershott Road, Church St & Segenhoe Manor Rd.
Michael G Nelson	1- Application H108 refers to possible access from Church Street, this is a private road owned by 4 occupiers and Woburn Estates all of which object to the proposal. 2- All the proposals are within a defined greenbelt and either in or adjacent to a conservation area and outside the village boundary. 3- Local plan permits no more than 2 dwellings to be grouped together. 4- Additional traffic will severely burden A507 which has just been bypassed. 5- Our visual amenity will be completely lost which we do not want to lose.
Michael Knights	Mad. Spoil the village green belt.
Mike Gill	No development on the greenbelt. This is a wholly inappropriate development plan and would ruin the village.

Submitted by	Comments
Mike Nelson	I personally and the vast majority of the village strongly object to this proposal. Ridgmont is within a defined green belt and as such no development should be permitted. Our visual amenity will be completely obscured by the proposed development; furthermore access to the site is not possible due to private (unclassified) roads. We fear that the current value of our homes will suffer due to the proposed development and the mere knowledge of such a proposal will stifle the sale of properties that are currently being marketed. The increased traffic will cause a burden on the village which after many years is just started to enjoy the benefit of the new bypass.
Mrs M J Bines	Infrastructure for development of these sites does not exist. This land is all green belt - should never be considered for any future development.
P Knights	Don't want to ruin greenbelt countryside.
R V Bridges	Greenbelt is Greenbelt. Moving the goal posts for avaricious reasons is not the solution. Is it correct that the owner of the land is on the parish council???
R. Coney	This is a totally inappropriate number of houses for the village.
Susan Hilton	I strongly oppose the any development on this site. The proposal would substantially alter the village environment, encroach on the Green belt and is outside the village envelope. Furthermore it could set a precedent for additional development in this part of the village as a gap between this site and the main village could be considered as ripe for development at a future date. Agers. A village hall on this site is too far from the village for suitable access for elderly residents.
Susan White	If housing development were permitted in any area of the green belt/area of great landscape value around Ridgmont it would set the precedent for other similar areas to be developed also. There is a danger of the village losing its character if building is allowed outside the current village area.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Kate Nelson	This site is outside the development boundary of the village and will impact severely on nearby properties, hindering the material enjoyment of the property and blighting a beautiful stretch of open countryside with unnecessary over development of a small village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H153**

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
John Hilton	Although this site is in the Green Belt it is visually contained between The developed frontage of High Street and Lydds Hill woods. The proposed development would be of a scale to fit within the village and there is the opportunity to provide sufficient land for a village hall and associated facilities while improving the facilities offered by the pub. I would support the development of this site.
S Letting	Ridgmont does not require housing to support the local school, this development is small enough not to impact on the traffic congestion in Ridgmont but will provide housing for families who wish to reside in a small village.
Susan Hilton	This site could offer potential for limited development within the village, it is contained and thus would not cause significant threat to the Green Belt. A village hall on this site would be ideally located.

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
Graham White	The development on this site is outside the village envelope, is in the Greenbelt and within a conservation area. I would only consider this site suitable for housing if it also provided the land for the new Village Hall being proposed for Ridgmont.
Mike Gill	Whilst I am not in favour of any green belt development, this is a fairly scruffy area and, if anywhere in the village is to be earmarked for a small number of houses, then this is perhaps a viable option. Any more than a dozen houses however, would be too much impact on the village.

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
Craig Murfitt	The field at the back of the pub is a nice buffer to the ancient woods, building right up to the woods would be a shame. Next we would be cutting down the woods due to the new residents complaining about the night-time wild life sounds disturbing their sleep.
Daniel Heginbotham	<p>The services in the village cannot support such a development and would create congestion at the junction with the new bypass as well as extra traffic going through Woburn, Husband Crawley and Woburn Sands.</p> <p>Local doctors and dentists are already not coping with the residents already in the area. From a traffic point of view the extra traffic to go where the jobs are namely Milton Keynes would further cause delays along the A421 which is a nightmare at the moment anyway.</p> <p>If the pub people want to develop behind the pub why hasn't the Stables been developed into a village hall or accommodation instead of standing empty for god knows how long - a perfectly good building.</p> <p>The pub has perfectly good accommodation and the village has a B&B anyway.</p> <p>Ridgmont is a lovely village please don't spoil it!</p>
David O'Carroll	<p>The access required is unattainable and would therefore be dangerous if attempted as a single track road at the rear of the stables building. The car parking space would be reduced, proving detrimental to our business.</p> <p>The Access to the proposed site is inadequate and therefore the development proposal H153 should be dismissed. I do not object to housing developments on any other sites in Ridgmont as long as they are accepted by the majority of the community.</p>
Jackie Biddiscombe	There is no need for further private housing in Ridgmont. The proposals would more than double the dwellings in Ridgmont - we are only just beginning to enjoy the peace and quiet in the village due to the opening of the by-pass, more housing would give more cars in and out of the village.
Kate Nelson	This site is outside the development boundary of the village and will impact severely on nearby properties, hindering the material enjoyment of the property and blighting a beautiful stretch of open countryside with unnecessary over development of a small village.
M White	My first comment - why did nobody in Ridgmont get a copy of "Talk To Mid Beds"? Next to the woods is a ridiculous place for houses.
Michael G Nelson	1- Application H108 refers to possible access from Church Street, this is a private road owned by 4 occupiers and Woburn Estates all of which object to the proposal. 2- All the proposals are within a defined greenbelt and either in or adjacent to a conservation area and outside the village boundary. 3- Local plan permits no more than 2 dwellings to be grouped together. 4- Additional traffic will severely burden A507 which has just been bypassed. 5- Our visual amenity will be completely lost which we do not want to lose.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Knights	Ridiculous idea. Spoil village greenbelt.
Mike Nelson	<p>I personally and the vast majority of the village strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>Ridgmont is within a defined green belt and as such no development should be permitted.</p> <p>Our visual amenity will be completely obscured by the proposed development, furthermore access to the site is not possible due to private (unclassified) roads. We fear that the current value of our homes will suffer due to the proposed development and the mere knowledge of such a proposal will stifle the sale of properties that are currently being marketed.</p> <p>The increased traffic will cause a burden on the village which after many years is just started to enjoy the benefit of the new bypass.</p>
Mrs Knights	Do not want to ruin green belt countryside.
Mrs M J Bines	Infrastructure for development of these sites does not exist. This land is all green belt - should never be considered for any future development.
Peggy Akerman	As tenant of the Rose & Crown PH I feel strongly that any housing development and a village hall would be hugely detrimental to our business. We would however be looking at planning permission in the future for log cabin style chalet to enable us to develop the business potential of becoming a destination pub. I would question the access and safety aspects of this plan. I have no objection to housing development on any other site as long as the village community are consulted and agree.
R V Bridges	Greenbelt is Greenbelt. Moving the goal posts for avaricious reasons is not the solution. Is it correct that the owner of the land is on the parish council???
Susan White	If housing development were permitted in any area of the green belt/area of great landscape value around Ridgmont it would set the precedent for other similar areas to be developed also. There is a danger of the village losing its character if building is allowed outside the current village area. An exception may be valid for this site if land were all provided for a village hall. This site does not have adjacent land which is likely to be proposed for further development and therefore it should be possible to restrict development to the small number of houses proposed for this site without leading to large scale development swamping the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H364

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Peter Phillips	Additional housing within Ridgmont is needed. The village population is too small to be a viable community. In addition, increased housing within the confines of the village would help support the village school whose numbers are significantly made up of children from neighbouring schools that are over-subscribed.
Mrs Sylvia P Woolard	The Village of Ridgmont will die without further development we have a good school which is in need of more children to make it viable, There is a shop guest house and public house which has suffered as a result of a by-pass and is need off regeneration This site would solve all the problems this village has
Mrs Tabitha Woolard	I feel that this village is a village with a big majority of elderly, a new development with younger families would lift this village ,I would Strongly support affordable housing, We need families with children to support the local lower school as most who go to this school come from Brogborough, Flitwick, Ampthill, Cranfield and Stewartby, the village has just been bypassed and I know the local public house is now feeling the effect and so is the shop, so it would help all of these, I would welcome the development!

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 Craig Murfitt	Some people are intent on concreting over our green and pleasant land, let the rural villages stay just that and not become sprawling towns, the last thing we want is to become another Milton Keynes or become part of that carbuncle mistake.
Mr Graham White	The land immediately adjacent to Ridgmont is Green Belt. This development would contravene the Green Belt policy and would increase the size of the village disproportionately. It would also open further development in Eversholt Road or beyond Church Street on land owned by Mr and Mrs Spearing, which would have an even greater impact on the structure of the village. I am vehemently opposed to this development.
Mr Hilton	I strongly disagree with this proposal because it is contrary to Mid Beds District and Ridgmont Parish Council Policies. It would completely change the character of the village with over 80 more houses- there are currently only about 160.it would undermine the green belt and break the village envelope.
Mr Iain Clapham	The path from Sedgenhoe church into Ridgmont is an important route for long distance walkers. This development would spoil the essentially rural aspect. The area has no local transport infrastructure and could not be ECO
Mr Nigel Burrows	The proposal for housing is far too dense and would create a mini village within the existing village. The developer is too greedy!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Ronanld Vincent Bridges	It is beyond me how 80+ homes can be squeezed onto this plot. There is the issue of parking facilities, each home on average will have 2 cars, that is quite obvious due to the location of Ridgmont, there no bus service as such and the train line is over a mile away. Parking in the village is bad enough now, with another 160+ cars and visitors it will only add to the problem. Please refuse this proposal for the sake of the existing villagers.
Mrs Judith Bridges	I can't agree to any of the proposal sites why can't any new housing be built on the end of the village so it doesn't interfere with any of the villages that they have resided here for years, if we have to have more houses which I agree we probably do to keep it supporting local businesses it's the only way I would be happy.
Mrs Marilyn Bines	Having first witnessed the opening of Ridgmont bypass the possibility of such a large complex of housing and associated extra transport in a small village does not bear thinking about. There are insufficient public transport options to cope with approximately a 25% increase in population. No garage, no post office locally, no doctor's surgery...etc. Infrastructure for such an increase does not exist.
Mrs Sue Isaacs	This proposal is too large. I am in favour of some new development in Ridgmont to support our local school, shop, pub, community. However, I believe this should be infill of individual dwellings within the village itself...rather than one large site like this. The old village hall would be ideal for a few small dwellings.
Mrs Susan Hilton	The development of this site as proposed would completely change the character and size of the village. It would result in an approx 50% increase in housing stock. The development of the site would be contrary to Green Belt policy, also it would break the existing village envelope
Mrs Susan White	I am very much opposed to any development of this size in Ridgmont. This development would increase the number of homes by over 50% and would cause imbalance in the community. Also any relaxation of the protection offered by the green belt, within which Ridgmont sits, could make it difficult to reject other proposed housing development on adjacent land which would totally swamp the village and alter its character completely. There are sufficient small pockets of land which could be developed for housing in Ridgmont allowing the village to evolve gradually by 5%-10% over the next few years rather than be drastically changed by large scale projects.
Ms Kate Nelson	This site is on green belt land and is totally inappropriate for housing development, due to its impact on the visual impact of the village and excessive number of houses. This site has previously been refused planning permission for residential development. This proposal alongside the others submitted would swamp the village and ruin its character. The village is better suited to small developments of 2-3houses in existing small sites.

RIDGMONT APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
<p>Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association</p>	<p>H364 Land between Eversholt Road and Church Street -</p>	<p>Strong Objection - Ridgmont Footpath No 8 passes through this site between Eversholt Road and Church Street and Footpath No 9 passes along the NE boundary between the end of Church Street and the site of Segenhoe Church. FP9 forms part of The John Bunyan Trail. The proposed site is within the Green Belt and should therefore be protected from development. We strongly object to this site and request that it is rejected and excluded from further consideration.</p>
<p>Tom Hilton</p>	<p>Ridgmont</p>	<p>My name is Tom Hilton. I was brought up in Ridgmont and return there when not at university. My home address is 44 High Street Ridgmont, MK43 0TS, my Oxford address is Robert Saunders House, 45 South Parade, Oxford, OX2 7JL. I have recently seen the development proposals for the village and I am appalled by the impact which the majority of the proposals would have on the village. The three sites H107, H108 and H109 would to a greater or lesser extent change the character of the village, particularly H108 and H109 which both push into the open countryside. H109 in particular is of such a scale as to overwhelm the present village, virtually doubling its size. It seems to me that site H108 is unsustainable on its own and would, in any event require the development of site H109 to make it viable. Both these sites offer the promise of a site for a village hall but, in my view both would be too divorced from the village to be truly effective in providing facilities for village residents and their children. I would support the allocation of the site behind the Rose and Crown. This site is well screened and would develop an area of land which is at present an untidy corner of the village. it would also provide the opportunity to support the pub with additional facilities and potential clients which must be good for the village in the long term. In summary my view is that I strongly oppose the development of sites H107, H108 and H109 and support the development of H153 Tom Hilton</p>
<p>Caroline Chaplin</p>	<p>Ridgmont, sites H107, H108 H109 H153.</p>	<p>I wish to voice my horror and disgust at the above proposals. Mr and Mrs Spearing bought this land from the farmer telling all and sundry that it was to STOP buildings being built in these areas when the by pass was completed. They have lied and deceived the village. I strongly oppose these plans. To think that they said the complete opposite is quite unbelievable, their greed and deceit is beyond comprehension.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Martin Beare	Ridgmont	I have very recently discovered that there is a proposal for new housing in my village of Ridgmont, having looked at the proposed sites, i simply can not believe that these site have been suggested as they are all on green belt land and is contrary to core strategy. As you will be aware Ridgmont is a small village and any future planning will have a massive affect on our quite village. The fundamental reason i moved to Ridgmont was because of the rural quite aspect and the protected green belt land that surrounds it. I will firmly oppose any future planning of this type as I am sure will the village as a collective. Thank you Chris for hearing my strong view.

Name	Subject	Comment
Andrew Lambeth	Ridgmont	<p>I have just attended the parish council meeting regarding the above. I will be unable to attend the exhibition at Aspley so felt I should send my own views to you. Having been a resident in the village for 16 years and a regular visitor for over 26 years the bypass has presented villagers with the potential for peace and safety that hasn't been experienced for over a generation. I therefore find the thought of any large scale development in the village most alarming. The areas 1, 2 and 3 are on land that provides a family friendly walking area that offers superb and historic views in the village and the old church, away from the motor way and Amazon industrial parks to the north. This area is regularly used by families with small children and the elderly as a safe traffic free environment providing an easily accessible peaceful haven for all. Although I accept that Ridgmont will have to play its part at some point in the future in sustainable development (along I hope with all the other neighbouring villages) I believe that any SMALL developments should be well considered and wholly in keeping with the nature of the village and in consultation with the villagers. I must inform you that I am concerned that most of the village residents were only made aware of this consultation process yesterday. It is all very well publishing information on a web site, however I suggest most people are far too busy to randomly browse web sites in the hope of picking up information. For a matter as important as this the democratic process should communicate directly with people to make them aware of such issues, the parish council have accepted this feedback at local level. A single sheet flyer with the essential information is always a good idea. With regard to ref H108 perhaps I misunderstand what is being said but is the land owner saying that if planning permission is given for that development then they will make land available for the village hall? Conversely that suggests that if planning permission is not given, the land will not be given for the village for a hall. I am struggling with the ethics of this. Some may ask why we need a new village hall when the village has a large and underused church that could be used for all manner of functions - and was used very successfully for this at Xmas with a huge turnout of parishioners. Thank you for taking the time to read this, please treat the content of this email as a private transmission of my own personal views.</p>
Carole Chaplin	Ridgmont	<p>Re: H107, H108 H109 H153.I wish to voice my horror and disgust at the above proposals. Mr and Mrs Spearing bought this land from the farmer telling all and sundry that it was to STOP buildings being built in these areas when the by pass was completed. They have lied and deceived the village. I strongly oppose these plans. To think that they said the complete opposite is quite unbelievable, their greed and deceit is beyond comprehension</p>