

SILSOE 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.

SILSOE APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H033

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
A.E. Tompkinson	Important to have direct access to Amphill Road.
John Thorp	Can be regarded as reasonable infill to the existing 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
J L & K D Chambers	A small number of properties would be acceptable and would not make a huge impact on local services, etc.
Mrs Clare Barfoot	If the Cranfield site goes ahead Silsoe will have grown beyond all recognition probably by double I think it would further spoil this lovely village making it a suburban environment with stretched infrastructure.
Phil Furneaux	Guess I might think differently if I lived at The Maples!
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district. Given the above this is probably the least contentious of the Silsoe sites.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
A Jarvis	The proposed Cranfield development fulfils the entire housing allocation not only for Silsoe but for the 39 large and small villages. All other Silsoe proposals for new homes should be disregarded if the Cranfield development is likely to be progressed.
Alan and Margaret Jenkinson	This land is some 5 metres above the land to the east, The Maples and the houses therein. Those houses already have housing above them to the east. More housing is being built on the high land to the south but at least that housing is being placed well back from the edge of the cliff. The proposed development cannot be so spaced and will have an overpowering effect on the houses in The Maples. The cliff faces, in any event, crumble freely and it is vital an adequate width of land is left undisturbed.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.

Submitted by	Comments
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village
C P Smith	See no justification whatsoever for residential development on this site. Proposed footpath would discharge onto busy Ampthill Road where there is no footway connection and this would require further infrastructure prejudicing the environmental features along Ampthill Road.
Christopher and Joan Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.
Chu Tai	Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land? The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure.
CPRE Bedfordshire	CPRE would oppose development of this small site situated outside the settlement envelope. Since former Cranfield Univ. campus site lying within the settlement envelope is likely to meet housing and employment development needs for this settlement within plan period no contribution should be required from this site.
D A Adams	I do not support the development of this site on the grounds that it results in the loss of horse paddock grazing land.
Frances Neal	Silsoe has been forced to have hundreds of extra houses on the college site which will totally overstretch facilities, inflict a huge amount of extra traffic and ruin the character of the village. More multiple developments like this are just not needed in Silsoe. They should be put in places with the infrastructure already like Flitwick, or Arlesey which is near the A1.
I J Kelly	This is a small in-fill development which does not contribute anything to the village or the community other than to provide six additional dwellings.
J Foolkes	This site unacceptably increases the urban envelope, further encroaching on Silsoe's open countryside.
Jacqui Shepherd	The site sits outside the Parish boundary and outside the building line of the village and must be classed as a Greenfield site. The site is immediately behind, but approximately 30 feet above 4 properties in the Maples. This will result in a massive reduction in light to those properties, and loss of privacy. The site is narrow and runs along the top of an old quarry on the greensand ridge, which already suffers from landslip into the gardens of The Maples. An increase in landslip could not be prevented. An extensive collection of burrows for rabbits, foxes and other wildlife run under the land from the side of the quarry, meaning loss of habitat for those creatures. Development of this plot would set a precedent for developing all Greenfield sites bordering the village. We understand that previous proposals to develop this site have been rejected.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
James Shepherd	<p>The site sits outside the Parish boundary and outside the building line of the village and must be classed as a Greenfield site.</p> <p>The site is immediately behind, but approximately 30 feet above 4 properties in the Maples. This will result in a massive reduction in light to those properties, and loss of privacy.</p> <p>The site is narrow and runs along the top of an old quarry on the greensand ridge, which already suffers from landslip into the gardens of The Maples. An increase in landslip could not be prevented.</p> <p>An extensive collection of burrows for rabbits, foxes and other wildlife run under the land from the side of the quarry, meaning loss of habitat for those creatures.</p> <p>Development of this plot would set a precedent for developing all Greenfield sites bordering the village.</p> <p>We understand that previous proposals to develop this site have been rejected.</p>
John Thorp	<p>This site sits above The Maples which are in an old quarry site and the quarry edge and the Maples form a natural boundary to the village. This development would break that natural boundary.</p>
Kathy Johnson	<p>Silsoe is already taking a disproportionate amount of development through the Cranfield college site. This site and its scale would add to an already overburdened village with inadequate access, facilities and would be an inappropriate over-large development shoe-horned in without any consideration of impact. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick.</p>
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	<p>Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of even more new houses in the village for a long time.</p>
Lizzie Brown	<p>I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, i am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.</p>
M Wallace	<p>Development will exacerbate already high levels of traffic and future traffic levels when the Mander Farm is completed. This village will already have more than its fair share of development with the proposed development of the Cranfield University site. It will become an urban sprawl and the village atmosphere will be destroyed. The school is too small, the roads are badly maintained and local facilities will be unable to cope with the increased population. This is a Greenfield site and would have a detrimental effect on local wildlife and the loss of valuable green space if developed.</p>
Martin Banks	<p>All the housing sites targeted for Silsoe use the same arguments - ie, current capacity at local junior school, but none take account of the fact that Miller Homes (140+ houses) and Cranfield (c.400+ houses) are already going to consume any spare capacity for schooling, transport requirements etc while creating massive traffic congestion etc.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mike Brown	This development is unnecessary. It is outside any development area and appears to offer no amenity benefit to anyone other than the intended developer. Any further developments in Silsoe should be restricted to the Cranfield university/Manor Farm site where appropriate infrastructure has already been planned in. This is yet another ad hoc development proposal intruding on to green space, contributing to traffic pollution, adding to already overloaded village facilities.
Mr & Mrs J Childs	There should be no further development after The college farm and main college sites. These alone will increase the size of the village by 1/3.
Myles Greenhalgh	Any access / egress to and from this site would be at a difficult and already dangerous corner on the Ampthill / Wardhedges Rd. The main objection is one that applies to all the 8 sites put forward for Silsoe. That is with the current plans to build nearly 600 houses in the village; any further development needs to be put on hold in order that the effects of the current doubling of the village are experienced.
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Tony Dutton	The site is outside the village development envelope and is currently green fields. Silsoe already has plans to take 524 houses plus business units - there should be NO further development

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H043

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
A.E. Tompkinson	Road network in vicinity supports development.
Simon Burton	Suggested access to the site is inadequate for the size of the proposed development. The site provides a habitat for local wildlife as it is currently meadow land, and is bordered by a ditch populated with amphibious life. Newbury Lane became blocked with building contractor development when two houses were erected behind no 40, the scale of the proposed development would create havoc. There is no public transport to the local rail station at Flitwick and the car park is stretched to capacity already.

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
G L Foat	Since the rest of Newbury lane has been built behind this might as well finish the job. A firm end to building beyond the northern boundary should be created. This will add traffic problems to the narrow Newbury lane which has a lot of cars parked on road
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. In addition to the above the access in Newbury Lane is dangerous at the best of times & recent development without adding to the problems.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Carolyn Hughes	There is already too much traffic coming through Newbury Lane and I think that the Cranfield development will be enough new homes in the village without you destroying the beautiful green spaces which we are lucky to have here. I do not think that the local facilities will be able to cope with the already approved developments so I am strongly opposed to any additional new homes to the rear of mine or other properties in Newbury Lane.
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.
Chu Tai	Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land? The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure.
Clare Newton	This site is outside the village envelope. Use brown field sites only for development. Silsoe already has several hundreds of houses planned. We do not want more. We moved to this village from a town. Our village is in danger of being spoilt by too much development.
D A Adams	I object to this development because: 1. It is a Greenfield site 2. It is next to a schedule ancient monument 3. The road infrastructure will not support the increase in traffic volumes 4. The village services will not support the development e.g. schools etc.
Frances Neal	Silsoe has been forced to have hundreds of extra houses on the college site which will totally overstretch facilities, inflict a huge amount of extra traffic and ruin the character of the village. More multiple developments like this are just not needed in Silsoe. They should be put in places with the infrastructure already like Flitwick, or Arlesey which is near the A1. This particular development would add large amounts of traffic to Newbury Lane which has already had lots of extra traffic because of development and is completely unsuited to heavy traffic.
I J Kelly	The position and layout of the design does not provide adequate connections into the existing village. There is no transport proposals to mitigate the effects of the increased transport issues within the village. There are no proposals linking the development with improvement to Flitwick Station eg parking and accessibility.
J A Raine	I object strongly to all the sites listed overleaf as I don't think the village of Silsoe can support any more new developments. The High Street is too busy now. A by-pass was built some years ago. We will be back to square one.
John A Childs	There should be no further development in Silsoe after the College farm and main college sites. These alone are sufficient for the plan. The village will be increased in size by 1/3.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Maple	We fully support the position taken by the Parish council that the existing development of the Cranfield University Site and Mander Farm more than doubles the size of Silsoe village and further development will destroy the intrinsic nature of a village community. Also access down Newbury lane is already very restricted due to parking along one side. The road cannot be widened and access to 100 homes would create a significant bottleneck and pose a severe hazard as the millennium park used by children runs along one side of the road.
Kathy Johnson	Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already thru the Cranfield college site. This site and its scale would add to an already overburdened village with inadequate access, facilities and would be an inappropriate over-large development shoe-horned in without any consideration of impact. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick and Arlesey. This proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate, and would also bring a significant increase in traffic danger.
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Lionel Mann	Will impinge on the adjacent countryside. Will be making Newbury Lane even more congested with parking at kerbside already busy in this area. There are no cafes or restaurants to support, last 2 public houses with dining facilities. There is no doctor in the village or community centre to support. The school appears to be fairly full currently.
Lizzie Brown	I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, i am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this. I live in Newbury Lane. It is very busy and we don't need any more traffic. People often do 50 miles per hour or more down here.
Lynda Fuller	I object strongly to any additional development in this area. Already people are applying to cram houses in back gardens. Silsoe already has many issues with traffic and any additional development will only increase this problem. On a personal level. I chose to live in my house for the open views, the house itself is not special but as i sit here typing i can look out onto the proposed site and see the wildlife, if I had wanted to look out on a housing estate I could have got a lot more house for the money I paid. Will the depreciation in my quality of life and the value of my property be taken into consideration? I invite any of the decision makers to come and have a cup of tea at the bottom of my garden and then you will understand. Please do not consider this beautiful natural area to be built on.

Submitted by	Comments
Margaret Buckingham	There are already plans for building in Silsoe on the Cranfield Uni site therefore any further building would be village overload. Newbury Lane would be unable to safely support the increase in traffic when gaining access to the proposed buildings Ref. H043. Newbury Lane is already quite a busy through road. It runs past parkland, a haven for local people to find peace and quiet. Increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on this in addition to the obvious safety and parking problems it will incur. Re: the above comment - Plans for a play area within the proposed building site seem unnecessary when there is already a children's play area on the opposite side of Newbury Lane at the far end of the park. Perhaps the planners have already recognised how dangerous Newbury Lane would become with the increase in traffic, hence this provision! Please ensure that the increased risk of flooding in this area, if grassland is build over, is considered.
Martin Banks	All the housing sites targeted for Silsoe use the same arguments - ie, current capacity at local junior school, but none take account of the fact that Miller Homes (140+ houses) and Cranfield (c.400+ houses) are already going to consume any spare capacity for schooling, transport requirements etc while creating massive traffic congestion etc. In addition, the idea that traffic from 30 houses can entrance and exit the estate from a single track road between two houses is madness.
Mike Brown	Newbury Lane is a quiet c class road that has struggled to cope with the increased traffic, congestion and negative environmental impact from a myriad of 1-off backland developments in recent years. This development will further exacerbate problems with zero, none, nil, amenity benefit. The site is not eligible for development as it is currently outside any development area. This development would be better sited as part of the Manor Farm/Cranfield university development with proper facilities and infrastructure.
Mrs P Mann	This site will create more traffic and the village is not that big that it can safely cope with more cars etc. - Taking into account all the other housing that's been suggested for the village. Also feel this development would impinge on the adjacent countryside.
Myles Greenhalgh	The access to this land has not been thought through. The congestion on Newberry Lane is already apparent. Any further roads leading on to the Lane would make it even worse. My main objection is as mentioned to my comments to the land at the rear of the Maples.
Neil Newton	The existing Developments in Silsoe will provide most of the whole counties requirement in itself and will effectively double the village. This additional site is not required - the village has already fulfilled its quota. The road proposed for access to this development feeds onto an already busy, narrow and congested road. Many houses on this road do not have driveways and therefore park on it. The exit view would be non-existent and the existing road can not handle the additional traffic generated. Potential damage to historic site. Preferable brownfield sites are the recommendation not these areas. Flitwick station already crowded and most new houses would have rail travellers. New housing should take this into account.
Phil Furneaux	Already enough problems with (speeding) traffic on Newbury Lane without additional dwellings.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ron Williams	This proposal as well as all the other larger proposals for development in Silsoe are inappropriate for the village. The village would lose all its fine character that it has left creating pollution, traffic problems as well as using green spaces up. Regards.
S .Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Stairs	Access inappropriate for so many dwellings. Development not suitable for village.
Tony Dutton	This land is outside the village envelope and Silsoe is already taking 524 houses on brownfield sites there should be NO further development - 380 out of the requirement for 400 houses will come from Silsoe.

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

Submitted by	Comments
John Kirkham	We already have a development of 400 homes planned on the Cranfield site. A further 30 on this site seem excessive to say the least for this village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H106

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

Submitted by	Comments
Brian Hilton	The consultation on this site has been excellent & as long as everyone involved stick to what has been discussed and promised then this is as good a scheme as one could expect. However, having to take this vast amount of housing will alter the village considerably & I think it is totally unrealistic or fair to expect Silsoe to carry any further burden of new housing & any other building should be carried out elsewhere with a moratorium on any further building anywhere in Silsoe.
John A childs	This site will be developed and despite the fancy consultation and plans the existing problems in an around the village will not be solved. The college farm site will cause severe parking problems and so will this. There should be no further development after this.
Mrs F Neal	Providing this site has an equal amount of affordable housing and retirement housing and a school and transport which is lacking in Silsoe especially when needing to get to Flitwick and Ampthill to visit doctors etc.
Phil Furneaux	There is a clear need for further thought to be given to the impact of the traffic generated by this number of additional dwellings. 375 dwellings could easily result in 750 more vehicles using the village and these will not all simply drive out onto the A6 at that end of the village - those heading to Bedford will travel the length of the High Street and those going to Ampthill/Flitwick/Milton Keynes will use Ampthill Road or Newbury Lane as ways of cutting through to the A507. To date, we see no sign of this being adequately factored into the plans.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Paul Russell	This development has the potential to compliment Silsoe very well. However, additional services need to be created - jobs, leisure and shopping facilities. It runs the danger of being one big "Barrett home" development which will turn Silsoe into a commuter village (just like neighbouring Flitwick), losing its character. I am also concerned about the extra traffic on the roads. With only one access through the village, something needs to be done as traffic during the rush-hour will become far too heavy. The A6/A507 roundabout also needs attention as the queues during rush-hour means that additional vehicles are using the village as a short cut.
Tony Dutton	Any development should be of a vernacular style to blend with the village. Care must be taken to address villagers concerns regarding traffic congestion and parking within the village and the sports hall and sports fields must be replaced with facilities owned by 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 or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	This represents a gross over development of the village. Entirely against the wishes of the villagers, but when it is viewed against the further developments now outlined it is an outrageous imposition on local people who are entirely opposed to it.
A. E. Tompkinson	Far too big a development for a village community - residents will be too far from central area to form part of the community, and are likely to use their cars even to access the community hall/shop. Traffic will cut through village roads eg Vicarage Road to avoid High St and access Ampthill Road--surveys which give number of cars per hour don't have any credence when the roads are narrow and have to be used for parking because houses are older and have no parking space. Only small additions to the village are appropriate - in different parts of the village.
B Miller	This represents a gross over development of the village, entirely against the wishes of the villagers, but when it is viewed against the further developments now outlined, it is an outrageous imposition on local people who are entirely opposed to it.
Clare Barfoot	This amount of development will significantly change Silsoe forever bringing heavy traffic congestion and strain the already strained infrastructure. Its the sheer number of houses that are proposed note the Miller homes houses are not included therefore it could add 640 houses!! If this goes ahead I feel Silsoe will have done her bit for future housing needs and should not be developed further
Clare Newton	I want to keep Silsoe small and rural. This development is huge and increases the size of the village by more than half.
D A Adams	I object to this development because: 1. The village infrastructure cannot support such a large development 2. The density of the development will be too high 3. Loss of open space.
Emma Russell	I strongly believe that building such a significant number of houses will have a huge impact on life in Silsoe. We moved to Silsoe because it was a village. If we wanted to live in a town we would have bought a house in Flitwick or Ampthill! The basic infrastructure is not there to support so many new people - especially the road system. I know that my objections will have no effect on the building of these houses (plus I fear, many more new houses in the future), but I am greatly concerned that the main high street in Silsoe will become a rat run, and ruin the "sleepy village" feel of Silsoe.
Frances Neal	I have ticked no here, if this is extra to what has already been approved. Silsoe cannot cope with more of these huge estates. They should be put where there is already infrastructure like Flitwick or near the A1 at Arlesey.
Kathy Johnson	If this proposal is in any way over and above what has already been approved for this site in Silsoe, then it is inappropriate. Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already through the Cranfield college site.
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.

Submitted by	Comments
Lizzie Brown	I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, I am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.
Mr J Foolkes	The new housing will not support existing businesses or infrastructure. It will be autonomous with its own shops/school etc. Integration with the historic village of Silsoe will not be achieved. Traffic levels will increase unacceptably. The rural scene surrounding the village will also be adversely affected.
Ron Williams	This site has had very similar proposals during the last 19 years all have been turned down for very good reasons some turn down at appeal so why should we be even thinking about it once more, why can't we have some open green spaces left in Mid beds. this is a great opportunity to create some thing for the village not more housing and pollution noise & traffic, Silsoe is not a large Village at this time, all though there is plenty of building going on here right now it is still a small village. we have had our fair share of housing here and should not have any more. The village has been said to be one of the jewels in the crown of mid beds let us keep it that way please!! Regards.
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Trevor Adcock	This development is excessive. This will change the whole nature of the village. The main concern is the lack of planning about the large increase in traffic and pressure on the local facilities. Concerns that I have raised at consultation events on traffic congestion particularly through the centre of the village have just been ignored. Why is there no link road to the west that cuts out the village? So many cars will come through the village to get to this development. A short link road has to be the better option. Is anyone listening?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H120

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
G Foat	Not very attractive next to a major road and roundabout.
John Thorp	With suitable landscaping and highways controls this area could be used as infill to the benefit of the village.
W B Wolfe	Small developments such as this are appropriate to provide extra housing in 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
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. In addition to the above the access in Newbury Lane is dangerous at the best of times & recent development without adding to the problems.
D A Adams	I object to this development because: 1. Too near the busy A6 2. Too close to the Wrest Park site/views from the garden of Wrest Park.
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Myles Greenhalgh	The land in question is a small parcel, at point near a roundabout that with the increased expectation of traffic may have to be expanded, requiring acquisition of the land in question.
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district. I think the development of this small site is in nobody's interest, except for the vendor of the land. Who on Earth would want to live in such a limited land locked location adjacent to the recently introduced roundabout? It also introduces development way outside of existing boundaries.
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Tony Dutton	This site is outside the village envelope and should not be developed. Silsoe is already taking 380 of the 400 required new houses for larger villages - there should be NO further development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H179**

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
A. E. Tompkinson	Would make village more compact - therefore limiting traffic, increasing community spirit, and sense of place, tying together village, and centring on the village green.
Mike Petty	This proposed site should be enlarged if possible. Infill between the A6 and Silsoe High Street is a logical development.
W B Wolfe	Small developments such as this are appropriate to provide extra housing in 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
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. It is possible that as this site would infill from existing housing and the A6 road cutting, and IF the proposed new village hall and play area IS provided, then the village would gain on balance.
Mrs D Bradshaw	Silsoe is obviously an area which has been identified for development and I feel this particular development would be of benefit to the village as a whole. All developments will have an affect on traffic in the area and efforts must be made to improve the infrastructure/roads etc.
Myles Greenhalgh	If there had not plans to double the size of the village currently in train then perhaps this application might have had some merit. However the 600(-) houses planned for the Mander Farm / Cranfield campus sites totally preclude and further large scale housing development.
Stairs	Apart from the infrastructure concerns this proposal has the merit of not affecting other residents in Silsoe particularly if the number of dwellings were reduced.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
C P Smith	Would need off-site lighting improvements to attempt to mitigate traffic impact, especially onto the A6 at the north. Too close to school - traffic congestion!

Submitted by	Comments
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.
Chu Tai	Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land? The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure. Do we really need this development? Surely with the proposed build at Cranfield University there is no need for even more large housing developments.
Clare Barfoot	If the Cranfield site goes ahead Silsoe will have grown beyond all recognition probably by double I think it would further spoil this lovely village making it a suburban environment with stretched infrastructure. Also Silsoe is not a large village by your definition e.g. over 3000 population some shouldn't really be considered.
Clare Newton	Silsoe has several hundreds of houses and businesses planned - i.e. Miller development down West End Lane and the Cranfield College site. A Greenfield development site like this should not be considered. Development should be confined to brown field sites. This field is outside the village envelope I believe. We want to live in a small quiet village - stop spoiling it by all of this development.
D A Adams	I object to this development for the following reasons: 1. It is a Greenfield site 2. Results in a loss of good quality agricultural land 3. Local infrastructure cannot support such a large development 4. Existing roads cannot take extra traffic.
Frances Neal	Silsoe has been forced to have hundreds of extra houses on the college site which will totally overstretch facilities, inflict a huge amount of extra traffic and ruin the character of the village. More multiple developments like this are just not needed in Silsoe. They should be put in places with the infrastructure already like Flitwick, or Arlesey which is near the A1. On top of this, who wants a village hall miles from the centre of the village. This is a facile, put in to dress up what is simply yet another proposal for an unwanted housing estate.
J A Raine	I object strongly to all the sites listed overleaf as I don't think the village of Silsoe can support any more new developments. The High Street is too busy now. A by-pass was built some years ago. We will be back to square one.
John A Childs	There should be no further development in Silsoe after the College Farm and main College sites.
John Maple	Although this has the potential to provide a better village hall the housing is alongside the very busy A6 and this is considered a low grade site with high noise pollution which will considerably add to the congestion of the village High Street. We fully support the view of the District Council that the development of the Cranfield University and Mander farm sites already exceeds that which a picturesque village can absorb without self annihilation. Please do not let it happen!
John Thorp	A previously rejected plan this would change the nature of the village. Other areas within the existing boundary lines are available for development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kathy Johnson	This proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate. Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already thru the Cranfield college site. This site and its scale would add to an already overburdened village with inadequate access, facilities and would be an inappropriate over-large development shoe-horned in without any consideration of impact. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick and Arlesey. Further, the village does not need a new village hall miles away from the centre of the village. This appears to be no more than a sop to sweeten the proposal.
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Lizzie Brown	I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, i am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this
Mr J Foolkes	This development will not integrate well with the existing historic part of Silsoe. The green space will be encroached on destroying the views of Wrest Park and vice versa. Traffic will also increase to an unacceptable level.
Mr John M Brown	There is no need for this development. Certainly there is no need for a new village hall as the village is served perfectly adequately by the present building - have villagers identified this need or has a self-interest directed developer suggested it? Any need for a new hall should be driven by villagers only, and it would be absurd to build a village hall at the complete extremity of the village. This land is not in any development zone for good reason - it provides green space and open countryside. It would have a clear negative impact on the countryside or local environment, as there is currently no development here. I see no evidence that a development here offers any increased amenity for local residents or villagers at large.
Mr W L Raine	Silsoe has already seen proposals to build a total of 524 houses (i.e. Miller Homes and the Campus Site) many villagers feel that traffic problems that these proposals will bring will cause massive traffic jams in the High Street. Furthermore the infrastructure would not support any more homes.
Mr. Geoff. Warwick	This proposal is inappropriate development of a Greenfield, productive agricultural site which would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the land at north east edge of Silsoe. The overall shortfall of houses in 39 major villages can be found by allocating more suitable sites Silsoe is already contributing some 380 houses with the development of the Cranfield University Campus (Brownfield) site which represents 95% of the 400 shortfall allocated to the 39 Large villages

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Neil Newton	<p>The existing Developments in Silsoe will provide most of the whole counties requirement in itself and will effectively double the village. This additional site is not required - the village has already fulfilled its quota.</p> <p>Road out of site would be onto a busy high street.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are the recommendation not these areas.</p> <p>Flitwick station already crowded and most new houses would have rail travellers. New housing should take this into account.</p>
Paul Wallace	<p>What is a fair share of 400 dwellings among 39 villages? Why does Silsoe have to have 600?</p>
Phil Furneaux	<p>Firstly, right next to the A6 is not the best place for more homes to be built. Secondly, concerns relating to additional traffic remain - this would mean around another 100 cars using roads which are already busier than they should be.</p>
Ron Williams	<p>This site has been turn down on appeal and on numerous occasions we should not be even thinking of it once more it is totally inappropriate for the village, it is green field site. We would lose even more open spaces in Mid Beds creating more carbon and other pollutants for the area we live in. Very bad place to build on.</p> <p>Regards.</p>
S W Barratt	<p>Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district.</p>
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	<p>Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.</p>
Tony Dutton	<p>This land is outside the village settlement envelope. Silsoe is taking 380 of the 400 new houses required by developing the Cranfield site. This is agricultural land which forms part of Silsoe's countryside setting Any housing would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the land to the north eastern edge of Silsoe. There are other more suitable sites in Mid Bedfordshire,</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H220

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 A Childs	There should be no further development in Silsoe after the College Farm and main College sites. A large development such as this would add more strain to the local infrastructure.
Warmingtons	Not all development in Silsoe should be located on the College site this will lead to an unbalanced community within the village. There should be a balancing site towards the north of the village leading off Ampthill Road in accordance with our earlier representations. Such development would take advantage of existing village facilities. Shops including the Post Office are close by, the Post Office being within .5 miles and general stores within .75 miles. With the A6 and A507 being close by advantage could be taken of the existing highway infrastructure. The site is not visible from nearby roads due to the saucer shaped nature of the immediate countryside. Expansion could take place without detriment to the local amenity.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
Alison Boyle	I'm concerned regarding the safety implications regarding the position of this site. The traffic has very much increased on the Ampthill road especially during peak time, it is used as a cut-off for traffic to the A6 avoiding the Clophill roundabout. The cars fly over the brow of the hill into the 30mph but are easily doing double that. Silsoe village has approximately 700 houses at the moment and with the pending erection of 500 more at the Silsoe Agriculture college and campus, is this not already enough expansion for a small village by nearly doubling it in size? The site itself is providing all types of housing 2,3,4 and 5 beds so surely there must be something for everyone! From a personal point of view, the existing agricultural barn which is viewed from my bedroom window is being demolished and replaced by houses which will afford me no privacy in my bedroom, dining room or garden as we are in a dip and the proposed site is on elevated ground.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.

Submitted by	Comments
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. Also this land is outside the village envelope as such and would build a vast swathe houses out into the countryside, I can see no justification for this site & the size of proposed development being put forward, other than greed, with no thought for the people of Silsoe & their quality of life.
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.
Clare Barfoot	If the Cranfield site goes ahead Silsoe will have grown beyond all recognition probably by double I think it would further spoil this lovely village making it a suburban environment with stretched infrastructure. Also Silsoe is not a large village by your definition e.g. over 3000 population some shouldn't really be considered
Clare Newton	This site is outside the village envelope. Development should be on brown field sites to save out beautiful countryside. Silsoe already has several hundred houses planned; the village life is in danger of being destroyed by over development. Silsoe's historical moat would be encapsulated by development.
D A Adams	I object to this development for the following reasons: 1. It is a Greenfield site 2. Close to scheduled ancient monument 3. Local infrastructure cannot support such a large development e.g roads.
Dean Warrillow	Silsoe is already an expanding Village that has had its fair share of building development in order provide additional housing. There is very little infrastructure to support any further development. It will simply become another large town with no identity.
Dr P Biscoe	This proposed development is in an area of countryside unrelated to the village, whose centre is nearly a mile away. The proposed access is close to the brow of a hill and would be a very dangerous exit/entrance for vehicles. When considered in relation to the proposed development at the Cranfield University site this is larger and between them would increase the village by about 45% which would have a significant detrimental impact on the village and its amenities.
Frances Neal	Silsoe has been forced to have hundreds of extra houses on the college site which will totally overstretch facilities, inflict a huge amount of extra traffic and ruin the character of the village. More multiple developments like this are just not needed in Silsoe. They should be put in places with the infrastructure already like Flitwick, or Arlesey which is near the A1. And, because this land is on the hill overlooking the scheduled ancient monument, the moat, a huge development like this will change the water levels with new drainage etc. This has been here 900 years it must not be threatened just to build houses.
G L Foat	This is extending the village in the wrong way. A separate estate with access onto a country lane. Will add a lot of traffic to the village and the Ampthill road, which is already difficult because of lorries from a nearby farm.

Submitted by	Comments
Gwen Tai	<p>Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land?</p> <p>The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure.</p> <p>Do we really need this development? Surely with the proposed build at Cranfield University there is no need for even more large housing developments.</p> <p>Why are we allowing these builds on Greenfield site or farmland?</p>
J A Raine	<p>I object strongly to all the sites listed overleaf as I don't think the village of Silsoe can support any more new developments. The High Street is too busy now. A by-pass was built some years ago. We will be back to square one.</p>
J L & K D Chambers	<p>Silsoe is already accommodating some 550 homes on the Cranfield sites and approximately 1000 extra cars would be entering the village and then if this site is also developed the impact would be unacceptable. Surely Silsoe would have contributed enough.</p>
J.Barker	<p>This site is open countryside and any development would have a massive impact on this.</p> <p>There is already a very large residential site being developed in the village, and the village does not have the infrastructure to cope with this site.</p> <p>The proposed access from Ampthill road is not suitable due to visibility problems caused by the brow of a hill and the fact that it is a very small road to take that amount of traffic.</p>
John Maple	<p>We fully support the position taken by the Parish council that the existing development of the Cranfield University Site and Mander Farm more than doubles the size of Silsoe village and further development will destroy the intrinsic nature of a village community. This must be the worst of all the planned schemes turning farm land into more concrete jungle. Neither Newbury lane nor Ampthill road is suitable for additional traffic and such a development would turn Silsoe into a town, desecrate the countryside and destroy green belt. Please do not let it happen!</p>
John Thorp	<p>Outside the existing village boundary and there are better areas nominated.</p>
Kathy Johnson	<p>This proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate. Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already thru the Cranfield college site. This site and its scale would add to an already overburdened village with inadequate access, facilities and would be an inappropriate over-large development shoe-horned in without any consideration of impact. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick and Arlesey.</p> <p>Without any doubt it would negatively impact on the hydrology of the area due to the topography, detrimentally affecting the Scheduled Ancient Monument. There are many other sites in Mid-Beds that would pose a threat like this.</p> <p>Ampthill Road is a quiet country lane and completely inappropriate for the levels of traffic that this would generate this kind of development.</p>
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	<p>Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Lizzie Brown	<p>I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, I am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.</p> <p>This estate would be built on the hill behind the moat where i live that has been here since almost the time of William the Conqueror. It must not be allowed to be built and damage this.</p>
Maurice Boyle	<p>I do not support the development of this site for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Safety - Lack of visibility over the brow of the hill, speed of the vehicles and the increase in traffic. There are no footpaths and none likely as we haven't even got one to Silbury Court! 2.Outside the perimeter of the village 3.Development by Millar Homes will be almost doubling the size of the village by the time it will be finished with all types of housing offered. I don't think another large development would be in the interests of the village and its inhabitants. Large housing developments can be found in towns that have the infrastructure, why ruin our villages and countryside? 4.Privacy-Our garden, bedroom and dining room will be overlooked as site proposed on elevated ground close to our house.
Mr B Millin	<p>Silsoe already being overdeveloped.</p>
Mr John M Brown	<p>This development is unnecessary; it is outside any development area with no clear reason for it. If further development in Silsoe is required then it should be linked to the Cranfield university development where proper infrastructure is being developed. This is yet another Klondike type rush and indicative of a piecemeal approach to ad hoc large scale developments in the village that will dilute the focus of the village and sense of community. If an increase in amenity benefit is a yardstick of the worth of a development then this offers nothing to anyone other than the benefit for the developer. There is no public transport, resulting in increased car usage; Ampthill road is a quiet rural lane not suitable for huge extra volumes of traffic.</p>
Mr W L Raine	<p>Silsoe has already seen proposals to build a total of 524 houses (ie Miller Homes and the Campus Site) many villagers feel that traffic problems that these proposals will bring will cause massive traffic jams in the High Street. Furthermore the infrastructure would not support any more homes.</p>
Mr. Geoff. Warwick	<p>This would be inappropriate development representing a huge intrusion into green agricultural land which forms part of Silsoe's countryside setting. The overall shortfall in Mid Beds can be met by allocating more suitable sites. Silsoe is already contributing some 380 houses with the development of the Cranfield University Campus (Brownfield)site .This is a very large number in relation to the existing 650 properties and also represents 95% of the 400 shortfall allocated to the 39 large villages</p>
Myles Greenhalgh	<p>Any access / egress to and from this site would be at a difficult and already dangerous corner on the Ampthill / Wardhedges Rd.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Neil Newton	The existing Developments in Silsoe will provide most of the whole counties requirement in itself and will effectively double the village. This additional site is not required - the village has already fulfilled its quota. Road out of site would be on Blind summit and are untreated in winter with heavy farm vehicle movements. Potential damage to historic site. Preferable Brownfield sites are the recommendation not these areas. Flitwick station already crowded and most new houses would have rail travellers. New housing should take this into account.
Nina Biscoe	Access to the site is poor and is on the brow of a hill. There would be no pedestrian access – the pavement ends at the end of Newbury Lane. The area is outside the settlement envelope and entirely within the countryside. The Council has already agreed that the paddock attached to Newbury Manor (an ancient monument) which adjoins this site should remain outside the settlement envelope. The development would therefore be contradictory to the surrounding land uses and poorly affiliated with the village. The site proposes no community facilities. It would be an autonomous settlement without any services of its own. The Council's own strategy is to 'concentrate development in larger settlements', which Silsoe is not. Significant growth for Silsoe has already been identified at the Cranfield site and village services could not cope with additional growth.
Paul Wallace	I trust the conservation area status will be removed too, as following all this construction work the look of the whole village will be severely damaged.
Phil Furneaux	This proposal should be dismissed immediately - it would be a blight on the village if it were to be added to the intended Cranfield site at the opposite end of the village - this would become a general sprawl and is just an encroachment on the surrounding farming land. Further concerns regarding the likely 300+ vehicles emerging from the new estate and driving through the village mean this proposal must be discarded.
Ron Williams	This site once more is a green field site and should not be built on it is out side of the village envelope and a inappropriate development for a small village in mid beds it would not do any thing to improve the village amenities at all. Regards.
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district.
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Biscoe	Silsoe is a Large Village in the settlement hierarchy. The Council's preferred development strategy outside of Major and Minor Service Centres is that 'development will be limited, the countryside will be protected'. Therefore the Council does not view Silsoe as a key settlement for additional growth and is unwilling to locate development within the countryside. This site is entirely located in the countryside. As a Large Village, Silsoe has a defined Settlement Envelope. The setting for proposed new houses is an area of current agricultural land that forms part of the open countryside that surrounds the village of Silsoe. The site, by way of its location, is unrelated to the rest of Silsoe. The Council has already identified the Cranfield University site as suitable for development. To identify further sites in addition to Cranfield University would contradict paragraph 3.9.1 that Silsoe, 'would not be a preferred location to accommodate significant scale development'.
Stairs	The infrastructure is totally inadequate to cope with such a major development.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lionel Mann	Would enlarge the village to the north as well as the south, do we need both ends of the village impinging on the green areas of the perimeter. Please consider very carefully all village sites before giving any planning permission.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H284

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
A. E. Tompkinson	Important that it creates local employment within walking distance.
John Kirkham	Sounds like a reasonable proposal for this site.
Kevin Sherwood	This will look to meet some of the potential need as we all get older one day!
Mr Ian Ward	This site is well suited for development as a retirement village if:- the village retains a post office. The local bus service would include a pick up point at 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
A Jarvis	The redundant buildings and land owned by the Research Council need to find a new use or be removed entirely for return to Green Belt/farming. A retirement village could fulfil some local village and Mid Beds needs in terms of accommodation and local jobs; this plan should be carefully considered against any alternative uses that could be proposed for this site.
D A Adams	If approved, this site needs to have a strict design code to ensure the buildings blend in with the historical setting of the Wrest Park site.
Frances Neal	In principle a retirement village is a good idea, but it shouldn't be this big. 11.5 ha is 26/27 acres, that is far too big an impact on the surrounding countryside.
John A Childs	An idea but surely too isolated for an old peoples complex?
Lionel Mann	Not the best available site.
Mr. Geoff. Warwick	Would like to see no development because location adjoins prestigious heritage site, however because the current B1 site is categorised as a brownfield site some development appears to be inevitable. Therefore would support development on southern part of site only for a retirement village instead of B1.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is simply no need for anything further. The roads and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be entirely destroyed.
Alan & Margaret Jenkinson	One has to regret this site has not been divided into two, north and south of the drive. The Office block is the south, one of the recently built properties, is in keeping with the mansion and it would be a waste of resources to destroy it. The industrial buildings in the north should be cleared but the site should be restored to parkland.

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Lovett	It's an idea for using this site, but not particularly appealing (as a potential resident). It is too far out. A doctor's surgery here would not be convenient for all the new developments in Silsoe. For example - a long walk to the shop and bus. The employment possibilities sound attractive, but create extra traffic. The Wrest Park gardens, if open, would be a benefit.
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. We don't need another care home particularly in this setting, what we really need, and none as far as I'm aware has been proposed anywhere in these schemes, is Social warden controlled sheltered housing, there is none available in Silsoe, so anyone in social housing who needs the extra care cannot stay in the village, this is wrong!
C P Smith	Site is entirely in the wrong location - it is just not sustainable.
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site. This proposal appears to be the least problematic of the suggested developments, but much more information would be required before an assessment could be made of whether the village would be able to sustain a development of this size.
G L Foat	This would add a lot of traffic through the village at all times of day (previously access to Wrest Park was mainly for employment and at weekends) so access directly off the A6 would be necessary. Would this add to the village or be self contained as its own "village". Most elderly people want reasonable access to amenities but this site would require road travel to get to these.
J A Raine	I object strongly to all the sites listed overleaf as I don't think the village of Silsoe can support any more new developments. The High Street is too busy now. A by-pass was built some years ago. We will be back to square one.
John Thorp	The wrong location for retirement homes and I believe they have been suggested as a way of justifying housing as employment development. Far removed for the village and any services and this area should be designated for agriculture use or better still cleared to improve the heritage use.
Kathy Johnson	I do not support this proposal on grounds of its size. It is far too big, and being sited next to the English heritage stately home is completely inappropriate. I have real concerns that it it will have a negative impact environmentally - particularly on watercourses for the lakes in Wrest Park, visually and in broader landscape terms. A smaller proposal using the already built on land would be much more appropriate.
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Lizzie Brown	I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, I am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.
Mike Brown	My family and I don't have a problem in principle with retirement development on this site but the size is disproportionate and totally inappropriate. At 11.5 hectares it would be far too large with detrimental visual, landscape and environmental impact given its position next to Wrest Park. It would have significant traffic impact on the village. For these reasons we oppose this particular proposal.
Mr B Millin	Would prefer facility for Silsoe such as hotel/conference centre.
Mr W L Raine	Silsoe has already seen proposals to build a total of 524 houses (ie Miller Homes and the Campus Site) many villagers feel that traffic problems that these proposals will bring will cause massive traffic jams in the High Street. Furthermore the infrastructure would not support any more homes.
Mrs B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything more. The roads & general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open fields and views will be entirely destroyed.
Myles Greenhalgh	I am aware of the need to provide jobs within the District. This site could be a potential location. However the land to North of the main drive should ideally be cleared of the current buildings to provide an open landscape to one of England's great historic houses. Indeed this is the view of the English Heritage. However for the land to the South of the drive within the walled area is ideal for light industrial / workspace development. Indeed it would conform to the original high labour intensive agricultural usage at the time of the building of Wrest House.
N Sayer	For retirement homes, too far from bus stops, shops. Can think of the worst place for elderly.
Phil Furneaux	The area around Wrest Park should not be developed into housing. The village currently sits entirely to the West of the A6 with only Wrest Park to the East - the retirement homes would be initially isolated but would also then lead to pressure for in-fill to join up to the rest of the village. Furthermore, this would lead to the road past Wrest Park becoming a busy thoroughfare and diminish the appeal of the house itself.
Ron Williams	We should keep the treasures we have in mid beds as treasures we have very few as it stands in mid beds, the site is of great interest to the public and should not be spoilt with buildings of any kind it has a listed building with in the area and all should be kept for the general public of great Britain as it now stands, please let us try to preserve some good things in life. Regards.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district. I am not in favour of banishing the elderly of our community to something akin to an isolated camp. It has nasty, albeit unintentional overtones of ghettos and concentration camps! I am sure the needs and contributions of out more senior citizens could be better accommodated with other options. It is, of course, a most convenient use a brown field plot by the incumbent owners. Cynical perhaps, but am I wrong?
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Tony Dutton	There should be limited development on this site to the south of the main drive existing buildings to the north of the main drive should be demolished and the land returned to historic park and the views from the main house restored. The original planning was for agricultural use and this should not be seen as a precedent for B1 or housing. Any development to the north of the main drive would have an adverse impact on the historic park and house.

Ref Number: H286

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
W B Wolfe	Small developments such as this are appropriate to provide extra housing in 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
A J Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
Alex Couper	Although Silsoe is designated a large village, at the moment it has one shop two pubs one having just closed, now a residence. The high street is a bottle neck which can not be resolved, the entrance, and exit from wrest park a hazard, one bus runs now and again, the Cranfield building will expand the village nearly double, can living in mid beds please stay rural.
B Miller	With the building already scheduled in the village there is just no need for anything further. The road and general services are and will be totally inadequate and the whole ambience of the village with its many open field views will be destroyed for ever.
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. Not enough details to determine whether or not the site would be suitable even if the initial paragraph is ignored.
Carol Miller	Spoil landscape & environment to Wrest Park House & grounds. Block light of housing on The Beeches development. Extra traffic onto narrow roads in the village. Encroach on listed buildings e.g. the Hodge houses.
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.
Derek Mattinson	Our own house/land borders directly on the area of land indicated for possible new housing development. Our concern would be if new housing were to be built too close to the boundary line. If new housing was to replace the existing unsightly prefabricated dwellings, and built in the same position as are the existing properties, then we would have no problem with this. We would like to know how many new houses might be built, what type /size of properties are proposed and their precise location. Unless all these concerns were met to our satisfaction, then we would be totally against the proposition.

Submitted by	Comments
Gwen Tai	<p>Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land?</p> <p>The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure.</p> <p>Do we really need this development? Surely with the proposed build at Cranfield University there is no need for even more large housing developments.</p> <p>Why are we allowing these builds on Greenfield site or farmland?</p>
Hannah Kaye	<p>This site should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of this site, will impact on the surrounding conservation area and historical gate house and entrance to Wrest Park. 2. There are a number of bats, a protected species and woodpeckers living on this site. 3. Access to this site, would cause a significant issue with traffic congestion and safety of pedestrians. This is already an issue in the village. 4. The village is already significantly contributing to the provision of housing development in Mid Beds, with Miller homes and development of Cranfield University site.
J A Raine	<p>I object strongly to all the sites listed overleaf as I dont think the village of Silsoe can support any more new developments. the High Street is too busy now. A by-pass was built some years ago. We will be back to square one.</p>
James Horn	<p>In view of the planned development of the Cranfield site this proposed and others in the current Silsoe site plan would have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the village.</p>
Jo Kaye	<p>This site should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of this site, will impact on the surrounding conservation area and historical gate house and entrance to Wrest Park. 2. There are a number of bats, a protected species and woodpeckers living on this site. 3. Access to this site, would cause a significant issue with traffic congestion and safety of pedestrians. This is already an issue in the village. 4. The village is already significantly contributing to the provision of housing development in Mid Beds, with Miller homes and development of Cranfield University site.
John A Childs	<p>No further development after the College sites.</p>
John Malia	<p>The village has proposals for a further 500 houses which will almost double the size of the existing village. Any further development will destroy the character of the village and green spaces.</p>
John Thorp	<p>This development as shown would remove the natural boundary between the village and the A6 road. Some redevelopment of the existing poor quality housing with improved landscaping could be acceptable.</p> <p>The view coming from Wrest House must be considered.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kathy Johnson	<p>This proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate. Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already thru the Cranfield college site. This site and its scale would add to an already overburdened village with inadequate access, facilities and would be an inappropriate over-large development shoe-horned in without any consideration of impact. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick and Arlesey.</p> <p>This plot is adjacent to the Conservation Area, and within the Wrest park Historic Park and Garden. This is part of a valuable community amenity and any development would erode away an unspoilt part of the Park.</p>
Keith Carter	<p>To build houses on this site would spoil the view from the heritage site and increase traffic from the high street. this site also has houses already established, some being Airey houses which there are not many left in the country and would be detrimental if demolished.</p>
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	<p>Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.</p>
Lizzie Brown	<p>I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, i am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.</p>
Matthew Kaye	<p>This site should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of this site, will impact on the surrounding conservation area and historical gate house and entrance to Wrest Park. 2. There are a number of bats, a protected species and woodpeckers living on this site. 3. Access to this site, would cause a significant issue with traffic congestion and safety of pedestrians. This is already an issue in the village. 4. The village is already significantly contributing to the provision of housing development in Mid Beds, with Miller homes and development of Cranfield University site.
Mike Petty	<p>The lower side of H286 will be subjected to undesirable noise from the A6, especially as the north/south volume of traffic will continually increase with time.</p>
Mr & Mrs V Pledger	<p>Do not think this site is suitable for housing at this time.</p>
Mr B Millin	<p>Considerable housing expansion taking place already</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing bridle path and footpath - Site too narrow - sandwiched between A6 and Beeches housing development - would be overdevelopment.
Mr. Geoff.Warwick	<p>Part of this site contains existing unattractive 1950 type residential properties and this area only should be redeveloped in a more vernacular style to blend with the parkland setting. Apart from this brownfield element this would be inappropriate development of a green area designated as a registered Park and Garden zone The more southerly part of this proposed development is even more inappropriate as it represents a narrow, green ,landscaped buffer strip between the Beeches development and the A6 Silsoe By-pass</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs A Wilkinson	I am very disappointed to hear a proposal to develop land for housing within the historic Wrest park in Silsoe. This area is designated as park and gardens, in a conservation area and most definitely green belt. Any development would totally impact on the surroundings in particular the listed gatehouses and gates which have recently been refurbished. When moving to the area 8 years ago we were reassured that development should be limited to the footprint of existing houses to the north of the main drive, and any development to the south of the drive would adversely impact on light for some of the houses in The Beeches and most certainly spoil the views from those houses. Residents have paid very high house prices to live here and with the already massive development proposed for the Cranfield site would totally destroy the character of this village. It would be totally inappropriate to ruin this historic site and begs the question why are mid beds council intent on destroying this beautiful village?
Mrs Ann P Burr	This site is a landscaped buffer strip between the Beeches and the A6 bypass. It is a public bridleway - with wild life present including bats. The land is within the historic Wrest Park and designated park and gardens. This site would also impact adversely on housing with lighting already in the Beeches.
Mrs Gilly Nixon	New residents have the potential for supporting the village shop, post office and school but will not necessarily do so. There are very poor public transport facilities; the bus service is only once an hour, north/south, with no service to Flitwick or Ampthill. This means villagers rely heavily on their cars and therefore congestion on the main road (High Street and Barton Road) will become worse. The centre of the village (where the shop is) is very narrow and is already often congested during the day with cars parked on both sides of the road leaving a very narrow, and rather dangerous, thoroughfare. Because of the age of many of the buildings in the centre of the village they do not have off road parking facilities and the number of cars parked at the side of the road have increased very noticeably over the past 2 or 3 years.
Mrs Marion Burnham	The land is within wrest park and designated park and gardens It is inappropriate development of a green landscaped buffer strip between the beeches and the A6 bypass. Any proposed development would impact on the listed gatehouse into WREST PARK. The village already has proposals of over 500 houses to be built any more will destroy the whole character of the village. Development should be possibly limited to the footprint of existing houses to the North of the main drive. Any development south of the drive would adversely impact on light for some of the houses in the beeches and also extremely close to the A6 bypass.
Neil Newton	The existing Developments in Silsoe will provide most of the whole counties requirement in itself and will effectively double the village. This additional site is not required - the village has already fulfilled its quota. Site is extremely close to major road Preferable brownfield sites are the recommendation not these areas. Flitwick station already crowded and most new houses would have rail travellers. New housing should take this into account.
Phil Furneaux	More in-fill right next to A6 is a bad idea. In addition, further traffic pressures would result, right at the gates to historic Wrest Park.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ron Williams	This proposal would destroy the centre of the village, building in gardens should not be even thought of at these times of increase in carbon emissions. It is a dangerous place to try to develop with limited access and the main high street of Silsoe being the only area to access this road at this point is very narrow. With all the extra traffic involved it would create more pollution and noise. Regards.
S Petty	Road noise from the A6 is bad living in the Beeches. Houses built near A6 will have constant noise pollution.
S W Barratt	Given the recently commenced Miller homes development and the separate plans for the Cranfield University site, the reasonable man might assume that Silsoe has more than had its share of recent expansion and development. By my reckoning the two aforementioned developments are a 65%+ expansion of the village as it stands today. I consider that any further multi-plot developments should be made elsewhere in the district.
Tony Dutton	The land is within the historic Wrest Park and designated 'Park and Gardens' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inappropriate development of a green, landscaped buffer strip between The Beeches and the A6 bypass • Any proposed development would impact on the listed gatehouses • Development should be limited to the footprint of existing houses to the North of Park Avenue • Any development to the south of the drive would adversely impact on light for some houses in The Beeches • The village already has proposals for 524 houses and any more would destroy the character of the village and there are more appropriate sites within Mid Bedfordshire.
Tony Kaye	This site should not be developed for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of this site, will impact on the surrounding conservation area and historical gate house and entrance to Wrest Park. 2. There are a number of bats, a protected species and woodpeckers living on this site. 3. Access to this site, would cause a significant issue with traffic congestion and safety of pedestrians. This is already an issue in the village. 4. The village is already significantly contributing to the provision of housing development in Mid Beds, with Miller homes and development of Cranfield University site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Burr	The land to the south of A6 bridge is currently agricultural and includes a bridal path. It forms a natural break between residential use and the A6. Building houses on this land will offer limited space (i.e. few homes) but a massive detrimental effect on houses in the beeches backing onto the land.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr W L Raine	Silsoe has already seen proposals to build a total of 524 houses (i.e. Miller Homes and the Campus Site) many villagers feel that traffic problems that these proposals will bring will cause massive traffic jams in the High Street. Furthermore the infrastructure would not support any more homes.

Ref Number: E21

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

Submitted by	Comments
R Wells	Very low lying land - flooding a problem?

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

Submitted by	Comments
John Maple	This is relatively low grade land perhaps suitable for light industry with the potential to provide local employment but I would want to see plans before deciding whether the benefits outweigh further urbanisation of this beautiful village.
W B Wolfe	Could give jobs to people living in village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A J Miller	There are more than enough employment opportunities within the general area to fulfil employment opportunities without the need to desecrate one of the areas most attractive villages and particularly by a development at such a prominent point of the whole village. It is completely outrageous in its concept and clearly put forward by officials without any regard for the ascetics of the village or views of the villagers.
A.E. Tompkinson	Employment should take place on Cranfield University site - existing building space only.
Anne Govier	I understand this land is very wet at times and fear that building on could upset the water table and maybe force the water to go elsewhere which could be detrimental to nearby areas.
Brian Hilton	With over 500 houses to be built on the old college site, Silsoe is already doing its part & any further development beyond this figure would be out of proportion to the size of the existing village. I am totally opposed to building on farm land/green belt, with the above Silsoe should not be expected to supply any further housing.
C P Smith	Would worsen traffic congestion through Silsoe. Would detract from vistas of Wrent Park when viewed from "new development" to the next.
Christopher Tarmu	Silsoe village is already making a disproportionately high contribution to the Government housing target as a result of the development on the former Cranfield University site. The ancient High Street is very narrow and there is already a serious problem with traffic congestion, and the village simply cannot sustain any further development in addition to what is already proposed on the former Cranfield site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Clare Barfoot	If the Cranfield site goes ahead Silsoe will have grown beyond all recognition probably by double I think it would further spoil this lovely village making it a suburban environment with stretched infrastructure. Also Silsoe is not a large village by your definition e.g. over 3000 population so shouldn't really be considered.
Clare Newton	The Cranfield College development is to incorporate business units, we do not need another site at the south end of the village. A business park here would totally spoil the rural approach to the south entrance to the village. This land does flood at its north end regularly!!
D A Adams	I strongly agree to this development for the following reasons: 1. Site comes within the Wrest Park garden site 2. Site visible from Wrest Park - business use unacceptable visually 3. Loss of agricultural land 4. Site floods 5. Visually obtrusive when entering the village 6. Local infrastructure cannot support such a development.
Frances Neal	This site is not needed. 1. Where is the demand for industry round here? In my time living here I've never seen it. 2. There is already a proposal for a huge retirement development next to the Wrest Park mansion, why then are these retirement homes needed? They're not. There are not that many people requiring this in Silsoe and if we are forced to have more development it should be for the people of Silsoe.
G L Foat	This area of land is subject to standing water after rain and would need to be adequately designed and build to allow for this. Although the idea of employment in the village is attractive, this would add a significant load to the infrastructure of the village.
Gwen Tai	Is it Mid beds policy to systematically destroy Silsoe as small village by building houses on any spare plot of land? The result of all of these new builds will more than double the size of the village, increase traffic and put strain on the infrastructure. Do we really need this development? Surely with the proposed build at Cranfield University there is no need for even more large housing developments. Why are we allowing these builds on Greenfield site or farmland?
J A Raine	What type of work will be provided on this site? Cranfield closed and the research institute is no longer.
John A Childs	There should be no further development in Silsoe.
John Thorp	As I understand your explanation this is linked to the development of the retirement homes at Wrest park? to move the B1 employment. With a major development likely on the Cranfield University campus site this plot should remain the green entry to what must remain a village. This development would spoil the approach to the village for the south and from Wrest House. This development would obliterate Silsoe's village feel more than any of the other proposed developments.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kathy Johnson	<p>This proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate. Silsoe is being forced to take a disproportionate amount of development already thru the Cranfield college site. This site would add to an overburdened village with inadequate access. Any further development in Mid-Beds should be in areas with better infrastructure and able to cope with it such as Flitwick and Arlesey.</p> <p>This plot is adjacent to the Conservation Area, and within the Wrest park Historic Park and Garden, part of a valuable community amenity and any development would erode away the Park. This proposal's reference to retirement homes - such a development is inappropriate, being right next to the A6 with loud and busy traffic presenting high disturbance levels. Secondly the applicant already has an application to develop a retirement village on the Institute site, away from the A6 and with less negative impact on the village that is far more appropriate.</p>
L. Lennartz-Nuttall	<p>Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.</p>
Lionel Mann	<p>This site, if industrialised, would make a poor impact & impression to visitors on entering the village, also this piece of land of the historic interest Park estate and if developed should be in line with green issues and not developed into a centre for light and heavy industry.</p>
Lizzie Brown	<p>I am writing this to show i agree with my mum and dad that Silsoe should have no more building on top of what we are going to have to put up with at the college. I do not want to live in a huge town with fast traffic and massive housing estates and neither do my friends. So, i am filling in the same answer for all the entries on this.</p>
Mike Brown	<p>Until there is published evidence that there is demand for industrial sites in Silsoe then this development would seem to be unnecessary. It is outside any development area, and there seems to be no compelling reason for changing this. A development will:</p> <p>(a) create extra traffic congestion problems in the vicinity - congestion and associated danger from speeding traffic within Silsoe village High Street as entry to any site from the A6 is not practical.</p> <p>(b) Were there to be any introduction of facilities e.g. "shops, hotels, post office, cafes, restaurants", this would detract from more appropriate plans that English heritage might have, and impact negatively on the service provided by the village shop that is a lifeline to Silsoe.</p>
Mr B W Millin	<p>Considerable Silsoe development taking place already - Not appropriate - its within Wrest Park, historic park and garden.</p>
Mr. Geoff Warwick	<p>Inappropriate development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is Greenfield agricultural land and is designated a Park and garden zone - Would have a detrimental impact on Green and open aspect on the approach into the village from the south - A B1 development of this scale would be completely out of character for an attractive village or any village - The Cranfield University Campus development includes B1 which is considered more than sufficient for a village - If B1 is displaced from Wrest Park more suitable sites must be available in Mid Beds.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs B. Miller	There are more than enough employment opportunities within the general area to fulfil employment requirements without the need to desecrate one of the areas most attractive villages and particularly by a development at such a prominent point of the village.
Paul Wallace	This will cause even more large vehicle traffic down Ampthill Road - a complete disaster.
Phil Furneaux	The Cranfield site will be progressed and meet all the needs of Mid-Beds for this village - to allow a further development directly opposite would be foolish and unnecessary.
Ron Williams	This land is totally inappropriate for the proposal and should not be considered in any respect. The area is of great interest for the people of Great Britain with listed buildings on it, close at hand. Why can't we not leave some of our wonderful treasures for the future? We do not want commercial buildings in this type of area. It is a beautiful place and should be kept that way. Regards
S W Barratt	I would not like to see this site developed as I feel it will compromise the look and feel of the campus redevelopment. Instead of open views for both the campus site and the southern approaches to the village, I fear it would lead an overbearing, claustrophobic scale of development that would mar the preliminary plans being drawn up for the campus site. Also, I should like to know much more on the planned use and types of commercial activities to be accommodated by this site before I could agree to its development.
S. Lennartz-Nuttall	Silsoe has already been forced into accepting an expansion (Cranfield site) that should rule out the building of any new houses in the village for a long time.
Tony Dutton	This land is outside the village envelope and any development would have an adverse impact on the rural landscape within the village. It is also part of the historic park and gardens of Wrest Park and outside the development envelope of the village. It provides a rural entrance to the village and any development will adversely impact on the rural nature of the village setting. Silsoe is taking 380 houses on the old Cranfield site and should not take any further development - there are many better sites within Mid Bedfordshire
Tony Kaye	This site should not be developed for the following reasons: 1. Development of this site, will impact on the surrounding conservation area. 2. There are a number of bats, a protected species and woodpeckers living on land adjacent to this site. 3. Increase the number of people using the footpaths to access Wrest park affecting wildlife and litter issues. 4. Access to this site, would cause a significant issue with traffic congestion and safety of pedestrians. This is already an issue in the village. 5. The village is already significantly contributing to the provision of housing development in Mid Beds, with Miller homes and development of Cranfield University site.

Submitted by	Comments
Trevor Adcock	This proposed development is not in the right place. It would only add to the pressure on the existing roads and pathways through the village (more traffic through the village) which will already be under an intolerable strain with the proposed development opposite this one. It should not be seriously considered. The wrong type of development in the wrong place.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E86

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Antony Dutton	The land is outside the settlement envelope of the village and is currently agricultural land which has been used for the growing of Xmas trees Access would be difficult and bring further heavy transport through the village Jobs are being provided at Wrest Park and on the brownfield site of the old University Campus both of which are more appropriate sites Development of the site would adversely impact on the character of the village
Mr Brian Hilton	Plans Under Part 1 if approved will ensure that Silsoe will be surrounded on 3 sides by developments larger than the existing community, additional development suggested here can only make matters worse, will the proposed 250 new jobs be filled by local people? or will it mean people from out of the immediate area travelling into Silsoe, causing more pollution and congestion, would the new units proposed be low level or 2 story or more. I do not see any proposal for social older people accommodation anywhere. With the massive increases already proposed I feel that Silsoe is more than carrying its fair share of new development.
Mr Geoffrey Warwick	Inappropriate development for the following reasons: - existing greenfield site outside the village development envelope - This site should be safeguarded to protect the green rural approach into Silsoe from the south - The proposed Cranfield University (Silsoe campus) development already includes 2500 sq.m of Business Park
Mr Ian J Kelly	The Cranfield Development includes the provision of employment space but the original proposals have been down-scaled on the detailed planning application because their advisors do not see the potential for employment space. Developments such as the Doolittle Mill have struggled to get anywhere near full occupation and this situation does not appear to be improving at this time. Public Transport within the village is minimal and therefore any development will increase use of private transport. Transport volumes will be critical factor within the village and on the A6/A507 over the next few years particularly with the Cranfield and College Farm Developments coming on stream.
Mr James Shepherd	Existing employment sites are not full and plans for brownfield sites at Silsoe College and Wrest Park offer best opportunity for development without impacting green belt. E86 would impact green belt and occupancy could not be guaranteed.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr John Brown	The applicant has given no compelling evidence as to why it is appropriate to site this industrial estate in a rural residential village other than a loose reference to it contributing to a target of 11000 jobs. 1. It contributes nothing to sustainability - the opposite is the case as there is next to no public transport serving this other than buses, and few office workers in rural settings use buses - they prefer cars.2. This will inevitably contribute to congestion in a village centre already significantly disadvantaged by large scale over development. This is likely to be disruptive through-traffic. 3. The applicant presents no evidence that there is demand from residents of Silsoe for jobs on this industrial estate. It is much more logical to site new office/industrial sites close to populations with higher unemployment OR4. In areas close to good public transport : Flitwick and Arlesey for example with rail links - and closeness to major roads -A1/M1 respectively.
Mr John Thorp	This site is adjacent to the planned major development on Silsoe Campus which will include extensive new build employment facilities. The Campus employment facilities will themselves be in addition to the existing Wrest Park employment facilities which are extensive with lots of vacant space now available which should provide for employment expansion for some years.
Mr Myles Greenhalgh	The location of an employment site in such a location flies in the face of everything that has been agreed between Turnberry, Cranfield University and the Parish Council; namely to preserve the rural aspect as one approaches the village from the south. Moreover the proposed site is Greenfield as opposed to the campus site which is officially designated Brownfield. The positioning of an access road so near to both the Taymer junction and A6 roundabout (already deemed to be too small and unfit for purpose) would add an unnecessary hazard to traffic on the Barton Road. As to the potential for job creation, the proposal has little merit when one considers the greater potential for job creation throughout the development of the Wrest Park site (to the South of the Drive, NOT THE NORTH!)
Mrs Anne Govier	This would just be a further step in turning the village of Silsoe into a town.
Mrs Anne Tompkinson	Increases linear village development, rather than compact, walkable settlement.
Mrs Kathy Johnson	There appears to be no case, other than to contribute to an overall jobs target - which any more appropriate development could also do - as to why this industrial estate should be sited in Silsoe : a residential rural village. And this is not a brownfield site, of which there are many in Bedfordshire. 1. There is only bus public transport serving this and few office workers in rural settings use buses - they prefer cars.2. This will result in more through traffic in a congested narrow historic village high street, which is about to suffer even more traffic due to the large scale development on the Cranfield university plot. 3. I know of no evidence that Silsoe residents are clamouring for jobs on this industrial estate. This will simply relocate employment from other areas, with no benefit to the village. It is much more logical to site new office/industrial sites close to populations with higher unemployment OR4. In areas close to good public transport : Flitwick and Arlesey for example with rail links - and closeness to major roads -A1/M1 respectively.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Rosemary Thorp	Wrest Park and the new Silsoe Campus development will provide sufficient employment space for the village. Development on the site will spoil the entry to the village and in my view does not conform with the recently published village plan which seeks to preserve the views and rural character of the southern approach (Page 8 - community woodland).

SILSOE APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
<p>Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association</p>	<p>E86 Land adjacent to Taymar Nursing Home, Barton Road</p>	<p>Public right of way Silsoe Bridleway No 6 is accessed from Barton Road via a pleasant grass path enclosed on both sides by trees that borders the northern edge of the site and continues eastwards. The Ramblers' Association have no objection to this proposed site providing the path and trees along the north boundary remain intact, the trees providing natural screening.</p>
<p>John Leigh- Brown</p>	<p>Silsoe</p>	<p>I am a resident of Silsoe and as such have been following the plans for its expansion with some interest over the last few years. I note from your web-site that a number of local landowners have submitted suggestions to further expand this village. Although I understand that plans for development of the Cranfield campus have yet to be finalised, I have reason to believe that some development will be permitted. With that and the recent approval to Miller Homes to develop the former Mander college site I believe that Silsoe will be over-stretched to accommodate any further residential construction. The character of this village has changed significantly over the 25 years of our residence here and as you know there are very few facilities within reach for the villagers that do not require vehicle transport. I also note that several of the proposals seem to fall outside the village envelope (I think that is the term) for building new homes or workplaces. In that case it appears that Silsoe will not only have more than met its part in the Mid Beds expansion plans but be at risk of encroaching onto land which gives it much of its character. There are one or two smaller plans on your list which may be acceptable since they sit within the boundary but they would need much more careful examination before drawing any conclusion. For example proposal H043 in Newbury Lane, while within the general contours of the current village would place considerable extra pressure on a road which is already dangerous due to congestion and the proximity of entrances to the Millennium Green which are frequently used by unaccompanied children.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
David and Fiona Tiffin	Silsoe	<p>We have looked at the proposals to extend the village of Silsoe and have some observations. The first is a general point: it has already been agreed that the housing stock in Silsoe will be extended by a further 500 homes on the site of the former Cranfield Campus. Even with the proposed extra amenities and school rebuild, the facilities within the village will be stretched and the corresponding increase in vehicle traffic will cause even greater congestion and potential danger, particularly in the High Street. For the foreseeable future, it is difficult to imagine how Silsoe, currently relatively small village, can cope with even greater expansion. On a more specific point, we have huge concerns about the proposed site at Newbury Farm, particularly in regard to access. In the 15 years we have lived in Silsoe, there has been a huge increase in the volume of traffic on Ampthill Road, with many drivers using it as a "rat run" between the A6 roundabout to the south of the village and the westbound A507 in the morning and evening rush hours. When entering the village on Ampthill Road, vehicles fly over the brow of the hill before the start of the 30 mph speed limit. They do not slow down until the dip at the junction of Newbury Lane. Leaving the village, drivers accelerate up the hill, well before the end of speed limit sign. The proposal for the land at Newbury Farm states that the access road would be comfortably within the 30 mph limit. This is not true: it is just 15 metres or less inside, making access to and from this proposed development, with its potential for upwards of 300 cars, very dangerous indeed. In our opinion, even if the speed limit sign were moved, driver behaviour on the hill would not alter. Another concern about the proposed site at Newbury Farm is that, as a nation of car users, it is very unrealistic to believe, as set out in the Newbury Farm proposal that people will walk to the village and its new facilities. From Silbury Court to the existing village shop is a spirited 20 minute walk and, even now, most people drive to pick up their newspaper, etc. A further 170 households would add to the existing congestion, and potential danger, especially in the area of the High Street. Yours sincerely, David and Fiona Tiffin.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Deryck Irons	Silsoe	<p>I write on behalf of the Silsoe and Campton & Chicksands Parish Councils in response to the consultation letter of 14 February from Simon Andrews, LDF Team Leader. Silsoe Parish Council has asked me to point out, in the strongest possible terms, that the village is facing unprecedented growth. Miller Homes have just commenced the first phase of a development of approx. 150 dwellings on the College Farm site and, for the past few months, the Parish Council has been involved in discussions with Cranfield University (and the District Council) about the future of Silsoe Campus (Site H106). On the basis that it appears highly likely that planning consent will be granted for the re-development of this 'brownfield site' (mainly for residential purposes), the Parish Council strongly objects to the other eight sites in Silsoe being considered for development in the Plan period. There are 661 dwellings in Silsoe at the present time and this number could more than double in the next ten years having regard to the College Farm and Silsoe Campus developments referred to above. Although some provision for employment has been discussed, it seems certain that there will be a net loss of jobs following closure of the Campus and, as a result, the two developments will be unsustainable in terms of impact on the road network and on the limited facilities, services and infrastructure in Silsoe. Even if the College Farm site is regarded as "committed", the Silsoe Campus development will provide a considerable proportion of the 'additional housing allocation' - more, in fact, than most of the identified 'Service Centres'. For these reasons, Silsoe should not be expected to take further growth on sites which are not contained by the present limits of development. Campton & Chicksands Parish Council welcomes the indication that no potential development sites are under consideration in the parish at present. Deryck Irons Parish Clerk</p>