

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

**Assessment of Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 Preferred Options responses April-May
2012**

June 2013

Prepared by:

**Planning and Regulatory Services
St Edmundsbury Borough Council
West Suffolk House
Western Way
Bury St Edmunds
IP33 3YU**

www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk

LDF@stedsbc.gov.uk

Tel: 01284 757368

How to view the responses

This file includes all those responses received during the April-May 2012 Haverhill Vision 2031 consultation by post or by email.

The responses in the database are shown as they were entered by the respondent. The only changes which have been made are spelling corrections.

The Council's assessment, and any action required as a result of the comments received, has been inserted after each response.

To view the responses by question please use the bookmark tab on the left hand side of the screen to select particular questions.

A Paper copy of the file will be available to view at the council offices at West Suffolk House, Bury St Edmunds and Lower Downs Slade, Haverhill.

Attachments submitted alongside responses are available to view as PDF files and are listed by reference number on the Vision 2031 pages of the Council's website below:

<http://www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/sebc-planning-policy-section/responses-to-vision-2031-consultations.cfm>

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	It is the height of folly to plan in isolation; yet there is no reference in Vision 2031 to the plans of surrounding authorities. For example, what is the point of planning for growth of high-tech industries here when Cambridge has expansion capacity and plans to the north and an established track-record and critical mass in high-tech? What of Sudbury, Stowmarket, Ipswich, Thetford? Are they planning the same things? Will their plans contradict St. Edmundsbury's? Some cognisance of the complexities and connections would have inspired more confidence. As it is, it sounds as if we think we live on a island uninfluenced by anything around us. Wrong!	The Borough Council is required, under the Localism Act, to consult with neighbouring planning authorities under the Duty to Co-operate provisions. The Planning Inspector examining the Vision 2031 documents will assess whether the Council has complied with the Duty to Co-operate provisions.	No changes required
	Quentin Cornish				My other general comment for which there is no dedicated space in this form is that the Vision in total is too timid, too hands-off and too based on assumptions about the external environment carrying on more-or-less as it is now. Surely no planner seriously thinks that the external environment in 2031 will be the same as now but a bit more so? Technological change, environmental change and degradation, economic decline, social division, raw materials costs and scarcity and competition from emerging economic superpowers are all likely to accelerate in the next 20 years, leaving the Vision looking distinctly myopic.	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts rather than speculation. However, the document will be subject to periodic review and, where necessary, amendments will be made to reflect any significant change in circumstances.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	These are comments made by people who will not have to live in Bury. Improve Bury as an attractive Market Town do not turn it into a City. Do not ruin what we have. Sort out the obvious well known road congestion/ bottlenecks before any more building is allowed.	Everyone has an equal opportunity to comment on the content on the draft document. The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	The fundamental problem with Vision 2031 is the oft-repeated mantra that 'growth is inevitable'. In this context, it is noteworthy that the most recent population forecasts for St Edmundsbury from the ONS show a reduction of between 2000 and 3000 persons in 2031 from the figures published only 2 years earlier. Clearly, forecasting 20 years ahead is a very inexact science. Bury has already had substantial growth and cannot grow forever. We need a policy for a defined limit to 'growth' so the town is not faced with the prospect of the endless urban sprawl embodied in the present proposals. Already the town is at a critical point with traffic density, when any small perturbation brings it to a state of gridlock, and the present proposals do almost nothing to alleviate that. While a network of cycle paths and walkways is good, the notion that it can make significant improvement to traffic congestion is utterly misguided.	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts rather than speculation. However, the document will be subject to periodic review and, where necessary, amendments will be made to reflect any significant change in circumstances. The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				None of the traffic that pours off the A14 will be affected by cycle routes. Furthermore, while it is possible to walk or cycle while unencumbered, the same journey with a week's shopping and perhaps a couple of small children is only going to happen by car. Cars are not going to go away and changes in technology will ensure this, for example by development of a hydrogen-based fuel economy. As for the repeated references to 'good design', the record of SEBC is uninspiring. Two recent examples are the grey wasteland of the Arc development and its appalling connexions to the old town via a few dismal alleyways, and the disgraceful liver-coloured structure that has been permitted behind the old Borough offices on Angel Hill. This hideous block in the historic centre utterly destroys the view from Mustow Street and the previous attractive roofline of the former Borough offices.	The draft Vision document seeks to ensure that realistic and attractive alternatives to the motor car are available in the town for those that are able and willing to use those modes of travel. If everyone still sticks to using the car then those that need to use it will not be able due to the congestion.	No changes required
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				The present proposals, all driven by developers and motivated by profit rather than function and attractiveness, will simply replicate existing urban sprawl elsewhere in the town. Indeed, the piecemeal approach by which the proposals have been produced for the five different growth areas is a guarantee of failure to have an integrated plan. More detailed comments on design in the proposed SE Bury regions are given below. It is evident that the present proposals command little support in the community. Correspondence and reports of local meetings in the Bury Free Press have been overwhelmingly critical, with virtually the only letters in support coming from Borough councillors.	Whilst it is not accepted that previous developments represent urban sprawl, there are examples of good design and less successful design. The purpose of the capital visioning is to identify those elements which are important to protect and those which need improvement. This can then provide the basis for a high standard of development	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	Of the six negatives the first two regarding disconnected estates and traffic congestion have not been addressed in the document as a whole. The emphasis on walking routes, whilst valuable, does not recognise the distances involved when carrying shopping, supervising young children or for the elderly. Furthermore the comments, although largely applicable, are made by people who will not have to live in Bury. There is no need to turn Bury into a larger town than it already is. The well known road congestion/ bottlenecks identified in the document and elsewhere should be resolved before any more building is allowed.	The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Everyone has an equal opportunity to comment on the content on the draft document. The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	The Society generally agrees with these statements, challenges and aspirations. However, the document should provide a broader indication of the timetable for new development. Will particular sites be prioritized or will several be developed in tandem 'and how will the programme be monitored over the next nineteen years? We consider that these issues will have a major impact upon the town's ability to accommodate new development. A brief explanation of how the Core Strategy determined the town's original housing needs would also have been helpful.	The phasing of development is already set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The delivery of sites will be phased across the plan period, in such a manner as to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place.	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	Of the six negatives the first two regarding disconnected estates and traffic congestion have not been addressed in the document as a whole. The emphasis on walking routes, whilst valuable, does not recognise the distances involved when carrying shopping, supervising young children or for the elderly. Furthermore the comments, although largely applicable, are made by people who will not have to live in Bury. There is no need to turn Bury into a larger town than it already is. The well known road congestion/ bottlenecks identified in the document and elsewhere should be resolved before any more building is allowed.	The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Everyone has an equal opportunity to comment on the content on the draft document. The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15909	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15912	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	I agree with the points made in the consultation feedback on p10 and the Prince's Foundation community capital visioning statements especially the top 6 negatives on p12. But these need to be addressed specifically. A weakness of the rest of the document is that it gives insufficient or no detail of how these problems will be rectified and with what priority. The significance of the six negative points should be made clear. I would add to 1.44 that solving the top 6 negative points must be given priority as a prerequisite to any future planning or development.	The consultation feedback on p10 is addressed in the respective chapters throughout the document, which follow the same format. The six positives and negatives are used to form the Vision Statements, which are developed further throughout the document.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie				It is unclear what the expertise of the authors of these statements were or what is meant by the jargon used. There is a failure to explain what is meant by 'walkable urban village' or even 'urban village' - a contradiction in terms given the respectable meanings of 'urban' and 'village'. It is too vague to be meaningful, certainly as a basis of a rational planning strategy. Furthermore, the phrase 'urban village' fails to explain what exactly the impact will be upon what are clearly existing villages and how they will change or be transformed e.g. Westley, the Fornhams etc. The phrase appears to have been plucked from the air without any consideration of what it actually would mean in reality so can hardly be considered a legitimate basis for a planning strategy or framework for development.	There are no contradictions in the term urban walkable village. It simply reflects a neighbourhood which has an identity, with a discernable centre, accessible within an approximate 10 minute walking distance.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Negatives a & b not addressed fully c Cycling routes on new build only. Pedestrian rather long distances. Def. no desire to turn Bury into large town.	The six positives and negatives are used to form the Vision Statements, which are developed further throughout the document.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	This is a commendable piece of work, with thoughtful and balanced themes on which holistic planning should be based. It is however completely inappropriate for their work to include the specific location for the new Health Campus as though an irrevocable and uniquely necessary decision has been made. Apart from this one issue (which we cover in a later section) Westley Village endorses this visioning.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		no	<p>The statements provide no Vision for the provision of new accommodation for 'Care' for the elderly living within the rural area or adjoining major settlements such as Bury St. Edmunds. With 25% or more of the total population being within the elderly category, specialist accommodation either in single units or as part of a 'Care Village' under the auspices of the concept of Continuing Care Retirement Communities is essential to fulfil the Vision required by the Borough during and beyond the Plan period. We have emphasised 'Care' which can be provided in a range of accommodation, some specialist and also particularly in new Nursing homes.</p> <p>We believe it very important for the inhabitants of the Borough, that the Council are seen to take a proactive approach particularly with the private sector to establish the range of accommodation required to meet the new healthcare standards for the type of accommodation required.</p> <p>Therefore a new Vision Statement is required.</p>	The needs of an ageing population are discussed at length throughout the document. These needs are far wider than just providing care homes, although care is an important element. The needs of those living within the rural area or adjoining settlements are addressed in the Rural Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the Vision Statements produced and the aspirations in terms of the five themes.</p> <p>"One Town Made Up Of Many Villages"</p> <p>We agree with the ambition towards connected, walkable neighbourhoods with Parish boundaries matching the physical village structure to reinforce the structure of connected but distinct neighbourhoods.</p> <p>"Getting Active – no sweat"</p> <p>We agree with the connection of transport, education, leisure and healthy living in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A strategic transport plan for the town that identifies existing pedestrian and cycle network and proposes new links. 2. A well publicised green network. 3. Minimising traffic congestion by promoting safe and convenient walking and cycling routes. 4. A school transport policy with increased bus services and accessible walking and cycling routes. 	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>As set out below in our response to the Travel Aspirations (Question 23), the feedback from our community engagement has been an interest in more sustainable patterns of travel but a reticence as to their appeal owing to the extent and condition of existing of pedestrian, cycle and public transport alternatives. This reticence is also a function of the way in which schools and other key destinations are currently distributed in the town. This creates an overreliance on the private car.</p> <p>We believe there is an opportunity for a step change in travel patterns through new school investment and better distributed community facilities together with other effects of the planned growth to 2031 such as better connected pedestrian and cycle routes as well as a wider and more frequent bus service.</p>		
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>"My Place – Respecting Young People's Natural Development"</p> <p>We agree with a townwide strategy for outdoor and indoor recreation opportunities. We agree with the dual use of school facilities and other measures to optimise sustainability such as maximising the use of existing facilities. In this respect, we would encourage the Council and the relevant stakeholders to plan future provision based on a comprehensive audit of the existing recreation infrastructure and services, its development feasibility and sustainability against future townwide demand. This should tie into the School Organisation Review programme.</p>		
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>"Growing Business that Work for Us"</p> <p>We agree that Bury St Edmunds has exceptional attributes in terms of its location, workforce, quality of life and potential to grow. We agree with the proposed actions in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Targeting niche markets that would be ideally suited to Bury St Edmunds. 2. Promoting better school/college business links. 3. Supply chain initiatives particularly in the construction sector. <p>A key factor in attracting new investment will be in terms of the availability of development sites and high quality business premises. This is in terms of improvements to existing estates as well as the development of new B class accommodation. We feel that this should be explicit within the Vision.</p>		

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While we do not disagree with the vision statements and support the proposed 'urban village' concept, we are concerned that in terms of connectivity the 'vision' is not realistic. It will, for example, be difficult if not impossible to ensure that each of the proposed 'villages' will be 'well connected' one to another (statement 'a'), and that active Bury residents will be able to enjoy a "fast and safe network of beautiful routes ... which (will) link all the urban village centres together" (statement 'b'). As we comment later, good connectivity will be essential for all those who need to get from one place to another in the town.	This support is welcomed. The difficulties outlined are acknowledged.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Negatives a & b. Not enough consideration given. Far too much expansion planned.	The negatives identified at a & b are key considerations throughout the document. These relate not only to proposed expansion, but existing communities where improvements could be made.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	The location of the new health campus would be better located on 68ha site Suffolk Business park site as shown on page 24 as it has access off A14, site close to Rougham airfield which can provide helipad; site large enough for expansion and supportive services.	The site identified is that requested by the health providers during the consideration of the adopted Core strategy. The Suffolk Business Park is required to meet the employment needs of West Suffolk.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	You do not need the Princes Trust and its computer models, etc to tell you how to develop the Town - Ask the people who live here or are affected by changes. The emphasis seems to be on walking / cycling. We have to own / use cars and its about time people recognised this and catered for car users. Most commentary, although applicable, is made by people who will not have to live in Bury. There is no need to turn Bury into a larger town than it already is. The well known road congestion/ bottlenecks identified in the document and elsewhere should be resolved before any more building is allowed. This building should not be on the Eastern side of town initially, its time to give this side of town a rest and develop other areas of the town where there has been no development since the 60's.	The Prince's Foundation work did not involve computer models, it relied upon asking people who live or work in the town in a structured manner. The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Development is proposed in a variety of locations in the town, rather than a single location. Initial development is proposed to the west of the town and a small amount to the east. However, the development to the east is dependant upon significant infrastructure works to deliver the Eastern relief road.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15961	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes Ltd			<p>The joint development team is positive about the Bury Vision 2031 document, indeed the Princes Foundation for the Built Environment has separately assisted the Council with community capital visioning following its involvement with the South East Growth Location and its Enquiry By Design process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the support for the broad themes and visions, many of which are based upon core values set out by the Princes Foundation, there are various points of clarification and review which should be addressed while the document is in draft form. This means that this Response Statement inevitably raises objection and comment but these points are very much intended to be read within the framework of the joint development team's support for what the Borough Council is trying to achieve.</p> <p>Although the document is intended to be adopted as an "Area Action Plan" for Bury St Edmunds it does not arrive at this important conclusion until Appendix 1. Indeed, the entire text of this document seems to be deliberately avoiding this term.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes Ltd			In addition to Objective 1, we believe that meeting the needs of families and young people should be prioritised particularly in view of the long term frame of the vision.		
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	The scale of the plan will make the centre redundant, with a risk of 'museum' status to the centre compounded by out of town shopping.	Disagree. The concept of the Walkable Neighbourhood is to serve day to day needs of a locality, whereas the town centre has a strategic role for West Suffolk.	No changes required
BVR15966	Mr J B Brennan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15968	Mrs I M Brennan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	<p>Mostly I do agree. I took an active interest in the work of the Prince's Foundation as can be seen from the photo on page 11 of your document. It appears that Peter White and Liz Watts are hanging on my every word – and the camera never lies! The urban village concept should be expanded beyond the nine sites identified on pages 35 and 36. When (and If) the hospital relocates to Westley the whole of the vacated site should be developed as the 'Vinery Village' with its own identity. Claims that the site is too constrained to become a sizeable housing settlement in its own right are false but development would include clearance of many trees and associated shrubbery.</p>	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton				Each of the five proposed new growth areas would also require an urban village centre – Moreton Hall may need two as they are one short even now – and this produces a total of 16. The 500 metre radius idea can only succeed if each local centre gives priority to pedestrians and cyclists – secure bicycle and mobility scooter storage is essential – and car parking provision is restricted to blue badge holders. If car owners are allowed to park at any location they will do so and there is no point in lecturing them about modal shifts or similar obscure concepts. Road layout must be designed to incorporate preventative measures to ensure there is no repeat of the traffic chaos which blights Stamford Court.	See above	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The concept has a sound foundation but there is a significant omission in the recognition of the motor vehicle with the lack of public transport systems in the Bury St Edmunds area and the villages beyond. When will the negatives identified (a and b) be addressed for the St Edmundsbury Borough.	The draft Vision document seeks to ensure that realistic and attractive alternatives to the motor car are available in the town for those that are able and willing to use those modes of travel. If everyone still sticks to using the car then those that need to use it will not be able due to the congestion.	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The town will become more isolated for those in surrounding estates and villages because of lacking infrastructure. Current infrastructure that doesn't meet today's requirements will become progressively worse. No mention of how cars will be accommodated and while those that can, will walk or cycle to work and school, the majority will remain car dependent.	The draft Vision document seeks to ensure that realistic and attractive alternatives to the motor car are available in the town for those that are able and willing to use those modes of travel. If everyone still sticks to using the car then those that need to use it will not be able due to the congestion.	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	The residents at Bury St. Edmunds will need to know that their planning authority will be making provision for a range of 'Care' facilities and accommodation for the elderly during the Plan period and beyond sufficient to accommodate their needs and which has been properly visioned and provision made within the Borough's LDF / Forward Planning Strategy to 2031 and beyond. This is because there are 25%+ of the total population currently in the elderly sector of which there is an increasing number requiring specific healthcare and where they would rather live in new, specialist residential accommodation or Nursing homes. This has not been taken account of in the lead-in to this paper.	The needs of an ageing population are discussed at length throughout the document. These needs are far wider than just providing care homes, although care is an important element.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery				Unable to answer as points have more than 1 issue in each.	There is no limit to the number of issues which may be addressed in a response	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	The Prince's Foundation vision statements refer to employment growth, to high quality design to create new communities, and to new activities for young people - all of which Countryside support - but does not recognise meeting housing needs. Meeting the housing needs of all sectors of society is critical to delivering a sustainable future for the residents of Bury St Edmunds and as such should feature as part of the vision.	Although the Vision Statements do not specifically refer to housing needs in the same way as employment growth, the requirement to meet housing need of all sectors underpins the requirement for the greenfield urban extensions referred to.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Positive C Bury not a safe area as disclosed by the local press. E) Negative. Present cycle routes used by a very few people so more not necessary. 1.45a) We do not wish to be an urban village (Great Barton).	The positives and negatives identified are the collective views of those who responded to the visioning. It is not expected that everyone will agree. Existing cycle routes are well used and rising fuel prices are encouraging more people to explore alternatives to the car. There is no suggestion that great Barton will be an urban village.	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Current infrastructures cannot cope with existing traffic now so there should be no further development before these are eradicated. According to Policy 4 of the LDF development should have no significant impact on local road network.	It is acknowledged that there are some traffic bottlenecks at present, but it is far from unable to cope with traffic. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no	1.45a The word 'hope' is preferable to 'will' - too dogmatic. b) Would like to query what is meant walkable urban villages. c) A basic assumption is being made that all people want urban villages in the first place. An urban village is a misnomer.	The use of the word 'will' is appropriate for a vision statement. There are no contradictions in the term urban walkable village. It simply reflects a neighbourhood which has an identity, with a discernable centre, accessible within an approximate 10 minute walking distance.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I believe that the growth suggested is NOT inevitable. The changes will change, wholly for the worse, the nature of the town. The expansion will cause congestion and should be confined to the brownfield sites only.	The need for growth has already been demonstrated. The vision seeks to accommodate growth without harming the character of the town or creating the congestion. There is insufficient brownfield land to meet the need	No changes required
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust			We support the reference to local biodiversity within this paragraph. However, we recommend that the paragraph is slightly revised because as currently worded it includes it appears to only support the protection and enhancement of biodiversity where this increases access into the countryside or provides the provisions of green open space. We consider that it is important that this vision part of the document establishes that biodiversity should be protected and enhanced as a core part of Vision 2031.	this is an issue which is explored further in Chapter 14	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not disagree with the vision coming out of the Prince's Foundation work, though we would wish to see reference made to climate change, with Bury St Edmunds becoming a greener town in line with Suffolk- Creating the Greenest County objectives and objectives elsewhere in this document and the LDF.	Reference to the challenge of climate change and recognition of Suffolk's Greenest County objectives are made at 1.50	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). The Princes Foundation Vision statements broadly underpin the expansion plans for the Town, which we oppose as laid out in our responses to questions 4, 23,27,28 and 29. However, the ethos of the statements would equally apply to more moderate expansion plans and population growth. Any new initiatives should be funded from sources other than the council tax.	This support is welcomed. The concerns referred to are addressed within the relevant sections.	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Bury is a market town with a centre. It should be kept to a reasonable size and separate from surrounding villages - not merged with them. Nobody will walk or cycle everywhere.	Bury will remain a market town with a centre and it is a stated intention that surrounding villages will be protected from coalescence. The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe				I do not agree with the concept of urban villages or parishes. I do agree with a well connected transport network with the town.	The concept of an urban village simply reflects a neighbourhood which has an identity, with a discernable centre, accessible within an approximate 10 minute walking distance. Many of these already exist within the town	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Too many houses infrastructure will not cope it is far too big a development for this SMALL market town...green open areas will be gobbled up & the whole 'vision' is ridiculous & unacceptable...	The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	The idea of an urban village is misleading. they will become urban estates tacked onto our town. There is no need for Bury to be significantly bigger. Walking routes will only apply to the more active, many will still use cars, especially the elderly and carers of children.	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts. The concept of an urban village simply reflects a neighbourhood which has an identity, with a discernable centre, accessible within an approximate 10 minute walking distance. Many of these already exist within the town. The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	The vision is not realistic, it's based on a utopia. The emphasis on walking routes, whilst laudable, does not recognise the distance when taking into account carrying shopping, supervising children, or mobility problems of the elderly. It is essential that the necessary infrastructure, community and other facilities are in place before any development is undertaken.	The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. The walkable neighbourhood is based on an average 10 minute walking distance. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	The vision is too large for the town. The content may not be of value to the local people and their needs.	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	THE A134 / SOUTH GATE NEEDS ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS PRIOR TO ANY BUILDING WORK.	Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed. Any development impacting upon traffic at Southgate will need to address the issues which are known to exist	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The first two negatives regarding disconnected estates and traffic congestion have not been addressed in the document as a whole. The emphasis on walking routes, whilst valuable, does not recognise the distances involved when carrying shopping, supervising young children or for the elderly. Furthermore the comments, although largely applicable, are made by people who will not have to live in Bury. There is no need to turn Bury into a larger town than it already is. The well known road congestion/ bottlenecks identified in the document and elsewhere should be resolved before any more building is allowed.	The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Everyone has an equal opportunity to comment on the content on the draft document. The draft Vision document seeks to balance the demands of a growing population and managing the impact of that demand on the special and distinct qualities of the historic town. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes	It seems to be an imposed view rather than a true reflection from consultations. The consultation feedback seemed to have been ignored and the master plan still carried forward.	The Prince's foundation work was founded upon community engagement on behalf of the Council in respect of the whole town and is quite separate from the work undertaken by the foundation on behalf of Hopkins Homes in respect of development at South East Bury St Edmunds.	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	Transport is a major issue within the Town without the additional houses and jobs. The plan allows for no alterations to the Town Roads and the volume of traffic they can accommodate. Something radical has to be done to the Town Centre's roads if it is ever to grow. The parking in the Town and the Moreton Hall Retail Park (Homebase) is insufficient now so how will it manage with the additional houses? The Rookery Crossroads run-in lanes are too short and will not be safe with the additional traffic from the Suffolk Business Park.	Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed. The slip roads at the Rookery Crossroads are a constraint to development and will have to be improved to facilitate the construction of the Eastern Relief Road	No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			no	The town is expanding rapidly, losing it's identity. See reduction of open green/rural areas. Lack of good quality built and designed housing which uses traditional methods.	This is why the community capital visioning has been carried out, to identify and protect the character which is recognised as important	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21704E	Dr. A S Blunden			no	I am concerned about the plans for the Westley Fields. I do not think enough consideration has been given to traffic problems that would arise from the large scale of the building plans on this site and am doubtful if this site is the best one for a new hospital. I understand that a traffic census along Newmarket road has not taken into account sufficiently the volume of cars during the rush hour especially in term time. I foresee that there could be considerable congestion problems with tailbacks onto the A14. Also traffic problems around the Oliver road Estate.	The traffic issues raised are an important consideration and have implications across the town. A traffic impact assessment has been carried out to ensure that these problems are avoided.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Does the need for 5900 (town) houses still the requirement. Old Data should be review with current data	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I disagree strongly with 1.45a). The new 'village' created adjacent to the Mildenhall Road estate will spill over into Fornham all Saints in time, which will make FAS one of Bury's 'villages' This is against the Council's own objectives. The field opposite the proposed development site will itself become subject to a planning application (adjacent to Pigeon Lane) and thus Bury and Fornham will become one, as sure as eggs is eggs as the saying goes. 1.45b) Rubbish. The 900 new homes built at the Fornham site won't be doing all their commuting by bike or by foot. For recreation purposes, I am sure folk will appreciate and use footpaths and cycle paths (where provided). It will NOT be the mode of transport of choice eg for work or domestic purposes like shopping. It is madness to suggest that it will. 1.45c) Strongly disagree. How will big new 3 -4 bedroom houses add to the historic heritage of Bury St Edmunds? 1.45e) How will new businesses (other than the developers) be attracted to Bury simply because there are 6000 new homes here?	The plan is quite clear that the protection of surrounding villages such as Fornham all Saints is a pre-requisite of any development. The concept of an urban village does not include coalescence with existing villages. It is not suggested that all journeys should be carried out by foot or cycle, but the vast majority of residents will be able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Good quality modern development can add to a town's heritage. heritage is not restricted to historic buildings. Bury St Edmunds' location, character and amenities already makes it attractive to businesses.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			no	No need for growth of the extent proposed. Aspiration for new transport is not sufficient, there has to be concrete plans or current transport links will be flooded.	The document is based upon known and reliable forecasts. Transport links will need to be continually evaluated and reviewed through the plan period.	No changes required

Bury Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's Foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the Vision Statements arising from the work the Princes' Foundation did for the Council?	Question 1b - What would you change? Please expand on your answer	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	The phrase "urban villages" is a misnomer. Villages are rural and towns are urban. An urban village as described in statement b) sounds like a "suburb" - a more accurate description of the ensuing situation arising in Westley and Fornham in particular. Statement d) has a curious and narrow focus as regards provision for children. The negative (e) covers "younger people" generically and so I am unclear why the focus is on the 10-15 age group, potentially to the exclusion of others. No supporting evidence is provided for this.	The phrase urban village is not a misnomer. It simply reflects a neighbourhood which has an identity, with a discernable centre, accessible within an approximate 10 minute walking distance. The capital visioning identified the 10-15 year old age group in particular as being poorly catered for	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Significant omission in the recognition of the motor vehicle exacerbated with the lack of public transport systems in the Bury St Edmunds area and the villages beyond.	The current reliance upon the motor vehicle is recognised, and the issues relating to public transport are recognised. However, alternatives need to be catered for, particularly with rising fuel prices and an ageing population.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no	The proposals give no consideration to quality of life through providing green areas, which are a vital part of life here in Bury St. Edmunds. Growth at an alarming rate will destroy the town we know and love along with any wildlife in habitation.	Chapter 14 addresses this issue. In addition, all growth will need to include strategic open space and habitat creation.	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	10-15 year olds are important but so too are older teenagers and young people generally. All too often they are regarded as a nuisance, instead of the country's future. Aspiration in the Jobs section are helpful but a statement here would be welcome	As identified, the needs of older teenagers and young people is addressed elsewhere. The capital visioning identified the 10-15 year old age group in particular as being poorly catered for.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			In Section 3 there is no mention of the protected European sites in the area and the importance of managing growth in relation to recreational and urban effects. Breckland Council considers this an issue worthy of inclusion in this section. Growth in the wider area is not without its potential knock-on effects, which need to be fully recognised as part of this document.	Although the protected areas are located within the area covered by the Rural Vision 2031 document and are addressed in that document, reference within this document would be appropriate, recognising the challenges faced.	New paragraph inserted in historic and natural environment section.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	<p>The challenges for BSE have been underestimated by this Vision document, which seems to see the town in 20 years as being just like it is now, only bigger. This is unrealistic on even the most optimistic extrapolation of current economic, political and environmental trends. The change is likely to be much larger than between 1991 and 2011.</p> <p>The challenge will be to maintain the essential character of the town as a decent place to live for all its residents in the face of:</p> <p>severe water shortages reduced individual medium-distance car use consequent on extreme fuel cost increases sharply declining health of an aging population economic stagnation or cyclical downturn with little employment growth, especially for the semi-skilled, and continuing youth unemployment rising levels of deprivation with food and home-heating fuel cost increases outstripping benefit increases sharper social divisions between upper and lower socio-economic classes.</p>	<p>The significant challenges suggested do not appear to differ significantly from those identified in the document, rather the potential to address the challenges and achieve the vision is viewed in a more pessimistic manner. It is agreed that Bury St Edmunds is a sub-regional centre, but this should not preclude it from being a destination for people. In 1991 there was no Christmas Fayre, but over the past 10 years this has grown and attracts visitors from many destinations.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Quentin Cornish				The other challenge that planners have been reluctant to grasp is that BSE is not a destination for people in the major neighbouring cities and towns, and is not going to become one; I agree with its description as a "sub-regional" centre. [It is a pity the arc was not planned on this basis instead of with fantasies of people leaping on trains at Liverpool Street to shop in it!]		
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	Other significant challenges. With over 10% of the retail outlets empty in the town centre, another key challenge is how better to use the space, i.e. mix of accommodation and shops. Areas like Risbygate Street would be better given over to 'predominantly housing'. The shops in 'Cornhill' would be better if they were relocated to the town and Cornhill turned into flats or similar. Another key challenge is how to prevent 'Bury St Edmunds' becoming just another 'urban sprawl'. I see nothing in here, which addresses this point; in fact the opposite is true.	Agree that this is a challenge which will be addressed in the town centre masterplan	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	The most important challenge facing the town between now and 2031 is how to accommodate the planned level of growth and development without ruining the outstanding historic environment and character of the town.	This underpins section 3, but is not specifically mentioned.	Amend introductory paragraph to make reference to accommodating growth.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	Sort out traffic congestion 3.3a before permitting any further development. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just providing footpaths and cycle paths	There is no hierarchy to the challenges	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	The fundamental flaw in the proposals is that they are rooted firmly in the model of the past, where endless urban sprawl has failed to solve problems of adequate housing provision. We need to find new models that recognise this fact and stop destroying old towns by limitlessly grafting on more and more housing estates. Even the growth-obsessed SEBC cannot imagine that Bury St Edmunds will expand for ever until it takes over the whole of Suffolk. We need to envision a future where we say 'enough is enough; our town cannot absorb more people'. In some ways, this is happening already, as the most recent population forecast shows the 0-4 year-old population static over the period to 2031, i.e. no increase in the birth rate. The growth in population is almost entirely driven by a substantial increase in longevity, which implies very different housing needs to those of the Vision 2031 plans, i.e. not a rash of happy family-style post-war housing estates.	An additional challenge has been inserted around the need to manage the impact of growth on the environment.	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>Assuming however that the above issue will be ignored, challenges remain about overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion and issues of water supply. The present plan has no overall traffic management strategy, but seems to rely on a naive belief that provision of a footpath and cycle path network will reduce car usage. While it may have marginal effects and is not of itself a bad idea, it has no chance to result in dramatic changes in travel behaviour. Water supply is tackled only via proposals for improved water efficiency in new housing, but even so the overall water usage will increase if all these houses are built. There has to be some attention given to sustainable water supply in this very dry area, a matter brought to prominence by the present hosepipe ban over much of England.</p>	See above	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>The traffic congestion referred to in para. 3.3a should be resolved before permitting any further development. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just providing footpaths and cycle paths should be undertaken. The interface between pedestrians and traffic at junctions on major routes should be reviewed from the dual view point of pedestrian safety and traffic congestion. This is particularly true of Rougham Road between the Sainsbury's roundabout and Cullum Road.</p> <p>Park & Ride and/or Park & Share parking facilities would reduce congestion in and around the Town.</p>	There is no hierarchy to the challenges. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. Simply addressing one area of congestion may move the problem elsewhere rather than resolve it.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	<p>The Society generally agrees with these statements, challenges and aspirations. However, the document should provide a broader indication of the timetable for new development. Will particular sites be prioritized or will several be developed in tandem - and how will the programme be monitored over the next nineteen years? We consider that these issues will have a major impact upon the town's ability to accommodate new development. A brief explanation of how the Core Strategy determined the town's original housing needs would also have been helpful.</p>	The phasing of development is already set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The delivery of sites will be phased across the plan period, in such a manner as to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15812	Cattishall Residents c/o Mrs Joanna Meyer	Cattishall Residents	John Popham Planning	no	Please see detailed Objection - Section 5 While the Cattishall Residents have no objection in principle to the Key Challenges they object to the fact that while Bury residents face the 'certainty' of new housing there is only the 'challenge' of providing the required infrastructure to accompany it. There needs to be the same degree of certainty in respect of the provision of infrastructure as there is about the housing provision.	Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	The traffic congestion referred to in para. 3.3a should be resolved before permitting any further development. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just providing footpaths and cycle paths should be undertaken. The interface between pedestrians and traffic at junctions on major routes should be reviewed from the dual view point of pedestrian safety and traffic congestion. This is particularly true of Rougham Road between the Sainsbury's roundabout and Cullum Road. Park & Ride and/or Park & Share parking facilities would reduce congestion in and around the Town	There is no hierarchy to the challenges. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. Simply addressing one area of congestion may move the problem elsewhere rather than resolve it.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	1. The onward 'need'" for the amount of housing required of 5900 houses. 2. This is from old policy and older data taken in "BOOM" times and should be review more on today's stats.	Although housing completions have slowed due to the economic climate, the plan has a 20 year time span and needs to cater for future investment.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	I agree except for the following. Traffic congestion is not limited to areas around the A14 intersections. There are serious problems on Out Risbygate, Tayfen Road, access to the town centre, Cullum Road, the Southgate Green/Cullum Road roundabout complex and all associated roads, Moreton Hall and numerous others. There is already a crisis before a single new home is built. There must be a workable strategic plan and action before any further planning or development. 40MB broadband connectivity is a ridiculously low aspiration. Moore's Law for e-everything predicts a doubling every 18-24 months. Over 20 years 40 MB would become 330 GB. Nothing is mentioned about (eg fibre optic) cabling to every home (inc villages). There must be a plan to put every home and business on a much higher capacity network.	Agree that traffic congestion is not restricted to the area around the A14. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. Simply addressing one area of congestion may move the problem elsewhere rather than resolve it. Agree that 40MB broadband is a low aspiration using Moore's Law. However, the reference to 40MB broadband speed is not an aspiration, it is an acknowledgement of what BT is currently providing.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	<p>The whole position and status of Bury St Edmunds, its heritage, conservation status and historic landscape significance and the position of its villages have been inadequately considered or dealt with correctly. However, this is in keeping with a policy adopted by the Borough of disregarding planning policy guidance in these areas with respect to key developments in the past on occasion, as well as European law requirements and a policy of favouring certain developers who subsequently renege on agreements and commitments. None of this background is addressed in the Consultation Documents which it clearly needs to be, in order to establish the context and framework in which these latest set of proposals have emerged.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the view expressed is that such corner cutting policies have been practised for a number of years; some may note dissatisfaction going back as far as R v St Edmundsbury BC, ex parte Investors in Industry Commercial Properties Ltd [1985] 1 WLR 1168 where the Council failed to comply with a Direction and the then local plan.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>Since 2005 there has been a failure to have regard to a number of principles of planning law within the town centre itself, and there has been a lack of transparency with the approach apparently being taken by a number of officers and councillors. There is concern that other objectives may be being pursued with regard to planning that have not been disclosed.</p> <p>With regard to this consultation a number of councillors have made statements and acted in a way which suggests that key decisions have already been made ahead of the planning process and this consultation – i.e. the outcome of this consultation has already been predetermined and councillors who have described publically that with respect to housing “growth is inevitable”.</p> <p>Certain individuals from St Edmundsbury Borough Council have stated that thousands of homes are to be built – a 31% expansion – and officials and certain councillors are maintaining a position that local residents are in no position to challenge these assumptions and therefore required to accept this.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>Effectively, the resulting appearance is that whole issue has been predetermined. This is neither acceptable nor lawful and the consultation documents fails seriously to address the practical impact that would accompany such expansion and would seriously undermine a number of the claimed objectives.</p> <p>The fact of this predetermination indicates that this consultation is not a bona fide exercise in consultation whereby all assumptions are open to scrutiny but an exercise designed to obtain a particular result endorsing a predetermined scale of housing development, regardless of what the people of Bury St Edmunds actually say or wish. Effectively, this consultation has been supported by repeated statements by a number of councillors which can be taken as confirming that the outcome is predetermined, which would establish that this consultation is itself flawed.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>Further, a key consultation document issued to the public as part of this process failed to include the Howard Estate among the options, The relevant consultation form "Bury St Edmunds North West: Comments Form" . This form is labelled as part of the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 process but is also endorsed with corporate logos for Terrence O'Rourke Ltd and Countryside Properties. The inclusion of the logos of two private companies who have a vested interested in housing expansion in the area suggests again an element of predetermination in this consultation process, it suggests that the process is unfair and links exist which are not transparent.</p> <p>It also suggests that the interests of these companies are being placed ahead of those who live on or are concerned by the position of the Howard Estate and amounts to a breach of legitimate expectations.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>Again this calls into question the independence and fairness of the procedure when the Consultation acts to exclude consideration of the effects of the development process upon the Howard Estate. As a result any consultation has overlooked a material fact and is a breach of the legitimate expectations of local residents and prejudices any conclusions that would be drawn from this process, presupposing it to be a valid consultation exercise.</p> <p>If the outcome of the consultation has been thus prejudiced or predetermined – which judging by statements made by at least three councillors since February 2012 and the insistence upon numbers of houses in the thousands being fixed and unalterable then the exercise falls to be considered as a sham. Furthermore, from statements again made by at least three councillors since February 2012 there has been widespread misunderstanding of changes made by the Coalition Government to planning law. These have been misunderstood or misrepresented with a consequent effect upon public understanding of the issues.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>As a consequence, the St Edmundsbury Borough Council has acted unreasonably in law, pursuant to the Wednesbury principles as enunciated in Associated Provincial Picture Houses v Wednesbury Corporation [1948] 1 KB 223.</p> <p>Further, there is concern that this consultation in light of the above will effectively fetter the discretion of elected members of the planning authority, thereby rendering decisions open to challenge and correction with obvious consequences. See R v Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries ex parte Padfield [1968]</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Much work to be done on traffic congestion and cycle/pedestrian routes now, never mind the future.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	<p>The Village of Westley endorses the statements in Section 3, namely the key challenges for Bury St Edmunds in 2031. However, we would like to note that the future of Bury can't be discussed in isolation from its nearby towns and villages. Road traffic congestion is not simply a result of intra-town traffic, but is also a consequence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A lack of practical alternative transport options to and from the surrounding villages e.g. better rail connectivity, green and safe cycle routes from nearby villages; <input type="checkbox"/> Continuing competition for retail, which has drawn in much traffic from a wide radius of Suffolk towns. <p>As Bury grows it will reach physical limits and more emphasis needs to be placed on enabling other communities to reach critical mass for retail development in order to reduce the need for commute to Bury. It is good to see that Bury is a thriving retail and cultural centre, but most retail activities are zero-sum in the sense that development reduces spend elsewhere in the region at the same time as it generates more traffic congestion.</p>	The challenges identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed in facing these challenges and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		no	Your Statement on 'An Ageing Population' is not sufficient in the context of the Borough. Its main thrust is on the improvement or adaption of existing accommodation. There are not sufficient resources to carry out this sole provision and there needs to be very substantial input from the private sector in the provision of accommodation and specialist accommodation to provide the levels of care required for the rural community in particular. This is most particularly so where residents require 'Nursing home' provision and where the private sector is and will be the leading provider of this specialist accommodation in the future. The Borough does not have sufficient specialist care accommodation particularly in the provision of Nursing homes to fulfil the requirement and the needs of the Borough in general and particularly for the urban area of Bury St. Edmunds as detailed in reports previously provided to the Borough by our Clients.	New development can provide for the needs of an ageing population and include facilities such as care and nursing home provision and there is nothing in the Vision which would preclude it. However, new development will only represent a very small element of the total housing stock, when compared with the existing stock. This vision proposes to also address the existing housing stock and ensure that people have access to the facilities they require.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree that these are many of the key challenges for the Town but would also identify the following which have been highlighted through our own community engagement:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Public transport services. 2.Services and facilities for young people. 3.School places and school travel. 4.Sustainable development in terms of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The mix of uses. b. The quality of masterplanning and development. c.The delivery of infrastructure improvements in terms of utilities, community facilities and the highway network. 	Thank you for your support. The additional challenges which you raise are addressed within the document and within the draft Development Management Document.	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	<p>We agree with the key challenges listed in Bury Vision. Our concern relates to the fact that unless they are addressed at the same time as the proposed development takes place there will be major difficulties for the existing community - not least in relation to the question of A14 related congestion. What negotiations have taken place with the Highways Agency about this issue, and what is the proposed solution? The plan needs to state what is proposed, how it will be funded, and the timescale involved. The timescale needs to be related to the completion of new housing and employment development. (See comments on plan Objectives 6 & 7, in next item.)</p>	Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. The Highway Agency is a party to this document and has been involved in its preparation.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Traffic congestion extremely bad at present time. Can only get worse.	There is plenty of evidence of localised congestion problems being addressed.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15956	Miss Caroline Pettitt				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More trees in open spaces and in streets to help with global warming. 2. Space for nature to help wildlife. 3. Renewable energy for a cleaner environment. 4. Secure, rented housing for the poor, the old, the disabled and the vulnerable people. 	These are aspirations which are addressed elsewhere within this document, rather than challenges.	No changes required
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			yes	<p>I agree that these are the challenges but consider that no consideration has been given to the most important of these in my view 3.3a congestion. It appears that the Borough council have allowed the developers to dictate the requirement of future transport planning, undertake such research into traffic movement (on a limited scale) within the town and then have not insisted on conclusions to this research prior to the deadline of this questionnaire on the 30th April.</p> <p>An independent transportation model, which is not funded by developers, should be sort prior to any further decisions on this Vision document.</p>	There is no hierarchy to the challenges. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. The traffic modelling has been carried out. Whether the model is funded by developers or the taxpayer, it has to meet the strict requirements of the council, Highway Authority and Highways Agency, so does not alter the outcome.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			yes	I agree that these are the challenges but consider that no consideration has been given to the most important of these in my view 3.3a congestion. It appears that the Borough council have allowed the developers to dictate the requirement of future transport planning, undertake such research into traffic movement (on a limited scale) within the town and then have not insisted on conclusions to this research prior to the deadline of this questionnaire on the 30th April. An independent transportation model, which is not funded by developers, should be sort prior to any further decisions on this Vision document.	There is no hierarchy to the challenges. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. The traffic modelling has been carried out. Whether the model is funded by developers or the taxpayer, it has to meet the strict requirements of the council, Highway Authority and Highways Agency, so does not alter the outcome.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	The traffic congestion referred to in para. 3.3a should be resolved before permitting any further development. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just providing footpaths and cycle paths should be undertaken.. Park & Ride and/or Park & Share parking facilities would reduce congestion in and around the Town. The addition of traffic lights to roundabouts does nothing to resolve congestion but adds to it. The inclusion of pedestrian crossings on exits also is ridiculous and dangerous, causing further delays.	There is no hierarchy to the challenges. The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands. The needs of all highway users must be addressed including pedestrians at junctions.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15966	Mr J B Brennan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15968	Mrs I M Brennan			yes	Rates and rents should be reduced on shops in the town centre to encourage more individual retailers such as those in St John's Street. This town is no longer the lovely historic town I was born in and The Arc is an eyesore!!!	The council does not control rents or business rates, although it is able to provide rate relief for small retailers.	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton				<p>Of the ten themes I wish to comment on the first two: Tackling Congestion and The Town Centre. I want to start in the town centre because I believe that urban planning should go from In to Out rather than Out to In.</p> <p>There are far too many cars travelling around the town centre's narrow grid pattern of roads. Attempts to reduce car dependency have stalled following the sidelining of the Historic Core Zone (HCZ) in 1999. It should be resurrected for the benefit of pedestrians and town centre businesses.</p> <p>In particular, Abbeygate Street – sometimes closed to traffic but sometimes open should be closed to all vehicles 24/7. The only part of Abbeygate Street to which vehicles should have access is between Guildhall Street and Whiting Street and even here pavement widening and road narrowing is an essential element in improving pedestrian safety. Parking in this section should be prohibited.</p>	Congestion issues are recognised in challenge a). These town centre issues will be dealt with as part of the town centre masterplan which will be subject to full public consultation at a later date.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton				<p>It follows that Lower Baxter Street and High Baxter Street should become cul-de-sacs and two-way traffic permitted in both. On street parking should be restricted to commercial vehicles and only for the purpose of loading and unloading. The cooperation of Suffolk County Council should be sought as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>The Buttermarket area is mentioned on page 20 and I'm aware that a scheme to spend half a million pounds on beautification is under consideration. Town planners and highway engineers are drawn to such wasteful schemes like a moth to a flame. Instead, I suggest an experimental scheme using linked traffic cones for an experimental period of 6 to 12 months to gauge the effect. Doom laden predictions about shop closures can be shown for the nonsense that they are. After all, no car parking is permitted in Cornhill or Buttermarket on Wednesdays or Saturdays yet the shops prosper on both days.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton				<p>Traffic congestion is caused by motorists seeking to use the same bit of road at the same time. Some claim there is no alternative. So give them several options. Walking is the easiest. Everyone owns at least one pair of shoes and the majority of residents of the town centre and inner suburbs could walk to and from the main shopping area if they wanted to. Beyond Tollgate Lane, Beetons Way, West Road, Hardwick Lane and the entirety of Moreton Hall, it gets a bit harder. Cycling is the best option here but the disregard of safety is the major deterrent here. Town planners have let the cyclists down and they should admit it and resolve to correct past negligence.</p> <p>Not everyone is physically capable of walking or cycling anything other than short distances. And some have disabilities which prevent even that. There is the added factor that it rains a lot in this country. The obvious mode of transport for the majority of people is the '97 horsepower omnibus' commonly known as a 'bus'.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton				<p>Perhaps the horsepower has changed since the heyday of Flanders and Swann, although the younger daughter of the former appears regularly on BBC news programmes to explain why the British economy is in a permanent slump. Single-deckers are now the normal type of bus and given the height of some of the bridges in Bury this is something to be thankful for.</p> <p>Bus companies are privately owned and need to make profits. I'm opposed to bus subsidies but strongly in favour of local authorities working closely with firms like Mulley's and Stephenson's to ensure fast and efficient services from early morning to late at night seven days a week. Fitting gizmos in traffic lights won't achieve this; restricting private cars to cars lanes when entering or leaving the town centre will. As far as possible, the private car should be restricted to the ring road which links the A14, A134, A1302 and the A143 back to the A14. The added advantage of this plan is that most of the public car parks in Bury are located close to the A1302.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton				<p>These are all within walking distance of the town centre retail area so I see the logic in restricting on street parking in the town centre with a view to eliminating it by 2031.</p> <p>My submission on the Core Strategy gave a detailed description of the Circle Line Bus (CLB) route so I won't repeat it here. The key feature is restrictions at certain pinch points so that only pedestrians, cyclists, buses and commercial vehicles are permitted in short sections of Mustow Street, Wilks Road and Mayfield Road. This is a vital part of the scheme so that the bus companies can be assured that timetables will be adhered to and tailbacks a rarity. Engineering works in Rougham Road may be necessary to separate buses from cars and there is a possibility of delays at those stupid traffic lights at the Spread Eagle Junction but both Northgate Street and Eastgate Street would effectively be local roads only.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes	Maintaining Bury St Edmunds (BSE) as a rural market town, because there are sufficient 'metropolis' towns in the area you can travel to offering 'sameness'. We like BSE because it is different.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	Must be realistic regarding vehicular transport with the mobility and liberty this provides for people. However, the avoidance of congestion in and around Bury St Edmunds requires an integrated approach to all forms of transport which includes the motor vehicle. To do otherwise will diminish the attractiveness for the distant shopper and the tourist to visit the town. The town centre needs to be vibrant as a shopping and tourist centre. Infrastructure for jobs and transport needs to come before future housing to address current issues.	The integrated approach suggested is supported. The vast majority of residents are able to walk for a number of their journeys and if these are facilitated by better routes it would reduce the number of short car journeys and mean that those that need to use the car are more able to do so. Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>The dual use of school building has been talked about for years but only happens on a limited scale. The chaotic Schools Organisation Review ensures that there will be inadequate accommodation for education, making dual use even less likely.</p> <p>The ageing population will struggle until appropriate housing is delivered but developers and planners will continue to resist building bungalows as they are deemed an inefficient use of land. Challenge is to build suitable housing but it will not be met and 3-storey dwellings will continue to be the preferred option.</p> <p>Congestion will not be tackled because there are only two solutions; prohibit cars from much of the town or stop building, neither of which will happen. Challenge is to accept the car and cater for it.</p>	The Council will work in partnership to seek delivery of dual uses. The challenge of building appropriate housing to meet the needs of the community is recognised in the section on homes and communities. The issues of congestion are recognised as a key challenge and in the travel section. Town centre issues will be dealt with further in the development of a town wide masterplan.	No changes required
	Trevor Beckwith				<p>The experts appear determined to cover the Buttermarket and Cornhill with fancy paving. A huge waste of money but they will prevail. The challenge is to get real issues dealt with rather than the preferred recreational pastimes.</p> <p>The cattle market development (arc) is testament to bad planning, poor design and lack of ambition. Will it survive intact to 2031? If not, the challenge is what to replace it with.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	<p>The background in Chapter 2 includes very little reference to the challenge faced by the elderly sector and its requirement for future provision / accommodation / facilities including Care.</p> <p>Key Challenge (c) only addresses part of the whole question of the elderly. It does not deal with the full need for the elderly only provision in their own home. It is well documented that there are insufficient resources to satisfy provision for elderly in their own home and that is why the private sector have been modernising their portfolio and expanding their provision. This has been by way of new single use facilities or by the provision of Continuing Care Retirement Communities (Care Villages) as at Nowton Court providing a range of accommodation for the elderly in a scenic setting.</p>	New development can provide for the needs of an ageing population and include facilities such as care and nursing home provision and there is nothing in the Vision which would preclude it. However, new development will only represent a very small element of the total housing stock, when compared with the existing stock. This vision proposes to also address the existing housing stock and ensure that people have access to the facilities they require.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery				One statement covers 2 points - agree with part, not other part - unable to comment.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	<p>We agree with the contents of para. 3.1. However, there is no reference in 3.1 to meet housing needs and demands, which is critical for a sustainable future for the town. We suggest adding an additional aspiration for the town as a place in which "people's need for new housing is met".</p> <p>The key challenges should include providing sufficient homes to meet market and affordable needs. Provision of sufficient housing is critical for a number of the other issues identified. For example, providing new homes at Bury St Edmunds will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable the efficient use of existing infrastructure Place homes near to job and services and so reducing the need for travel by car, provide the opportunity to travel by non-car modes and reduce carbon emissions. Help to support the local environment 	This underpins section 3, but is not specifically mentioned.	Amend introductory paragraph to make reference to accommodating growth.
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	More churches, more GP facilities, more small local shops.	These are aspirations which are addressed elsewhere within this document, rather than challenges.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Education system needs to get sorted ASAP.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Development of higher education, i.e. university for Bury. Increase in parking spaces.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	The challenges identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed in facing these challenges and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We would not disagree with these challenges for the town, though we would suggest that, as above, climate change should be recognised as a key challenge for Bury St Edmunds. In the tackling congestion challenge, reference should be made to encouraging sustainable methods of transport.	An additional challenge has been inserted around the need to manage the impact of growth on the environment.	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			In terms of the key challenges for the town, the Society strongly agrees that tackling (and not exacerbating) congestion is a key issue together with enhancement of the public realm. the provision of jobs must underpin the substantive element of housing growth beyond that created by organic household formation. The Society is supportive of mixed uses that avoids the rather dated approach whereby homes and employment sites are segregated. To the Society, the 'urban village' approach is founded upon mixed uses and the urban vitality and inherently sustainable activity patterns that self contained neighbourhoods are capable of fostering.	The comments are noted. A mixed use approach to new development on the strategic growth areas is being followed.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b).The key challenges outlined in Vision broadly underpin the expansion plans for the Town, which we oppose as laid out in our responses to questions 4, 23,27,28 and 29. However, the ethos of the statements would equally apply to more moderate expansion plans and population growth.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			Any new initiatives should be funded from sources other than the council tax. Climate change [page 16, item 2.13 -2.15 of Vision], particularly drought/water shortages, is almost certain to have a significant effect upon East Anglia over the next 20 years and must be a key challenge. Building another 6,350 houses and 15,000 or so in the Borough as a whole, will only compound the situation, particularly when considered with the other proposed developments throughout East Anglia. Also, food security means we should be saving land for food, not building on it. See our responses to Question 27.	An additional challenge has been inserted around the need to manage the impact of growth on the environment.	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	The Traffic Congestion referred to in 3.3 (a) (page 21). There has been insufficient enough consultation planning/provisional implication on this issue and even being identified as a problem in the earlier policy's (2008) there has never been redress in a positive manner just more debate with no results and the conclusion is there is not one. Totally Unsatisfactory. The essential improvements to infrastructure must be in place & resolved implicated before master plan(s) construction is started anywhere in Bury St Edmunds is started on any of the Vision 2031 development sites. Otherwise it will cause major grid lock for the future. One that will not be reversible. What, if any allowance has been made for the development of Thefford with their Spatial Strategy of some 6000 new homes within the same time frame as Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031. What impact will have on Bury St Edmunds I A 134.Ingham The Fornhams, Fornham Road, St Saviours I A14 Junction 43.	The issue of congestion is recognised as a key challenge and further detail on how this will be addressed is set out in the section on travel.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				The Traffic Report Commissioned by all the developers on the town vision has not be completed within time for this consultation and seems to be " held up" for further data to become available before it can be published. This report is one of the major KEY factors for the future road infrastructure of Bury St Edmunds. The only "solution" put forward is telling people to walk cycle or the bus. Not realistic now or in the future (Unfortunately).	See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	Infrastructure to ensure any development is sustainable - either introduce new or update/modify existing. Don't just leave it.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Not to repeat the mistakes of the 1960s as experienced in Haverhill and Thetford. All major transport network problems resolved and implemented before any further large scale development is undertaken.	Transport issues are dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short				1) Local production of food, fuel, goods, material. 2) renewable energy 3) Spaces for nature in the town 4) Secure, genuinely affordable housing for persons of low income 5) Stabilising then reducing population to genuinely sustainable level.	These are aspirations which are addressed elsewhere within this document, rather than challenges.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Broadband installation patchy - businesses are not benefitting as they should.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Positive Action needs to be taken now to provide more employment land for the future and other retail / office /leisure opportunities	Provision of employment land is set out in section 6	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	We must have infrastructure improvement and traffic congestion addressed BEFORE ANY DEVELOPMENT	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no	A healthy natural environment has many health, social and economic benefits, and this is a key challenge. More so than 'broadband', as your description of this key challenge explains that broadband is already being improved.	These are aspirations which are addressed elsewhere within this document, rather than challenges.	No changes required
BVR21564E	Cllr Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	Traffic congestion is a real problem at certain times of the day, both around the town and on the A14. This has not been significantly addressed	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	The history of the town is key to is local and international value.	This issue is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	THE NEEDS TO BE A REVIEW OF HOUSING NUMBERS AS THE ONES QUOTED ARE OF OLD DATA IN MORE ECONOMIC AFFLUENT TIMES.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no	I believe the traffic congestion is the biggest challenge and without solving it you should not increase the amount of houses in the area. You say bigger roads is not the solution then also neither is building more houses and at a faster rate.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	Recognising that there is a separate Rural vision, it is nevertheless difficult to completely separate the two as developments in the nearby villages impact on the town itself, particularly with regard to roads and transport, employment, schools and retail.	Agree that all three Vision documents are holistically linked and that read together they set out the future vision for the borough.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The traffic congestion referred to in para. 3.3a should be resolved before permitting any further development. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just providing footpaths and cycle paths, should be undertaken. The interface between pedestrians and traffic at junctions on major routes should be reviewed from the dual view point of pedestrian safety and traffic congestion. This is particularly true of Rougham Road between the Sainsbury's roundabout and Cullum Road. Park & Ride and/or Park & Share parking facilities would reduce congestion in and around the Town.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The traffic congestion referred to in para. 3.3a should be resolved before allowing any further building. This means major infrastructure improvement, not just footpaths and cycle paths. Park & Ride and/or Park & Share parking facilities would reduce congestion in and around the Town.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes	Not Enough on Road infrastructure with all this happening Bury St Edmunds Roads is MORE THAN A14 junctions.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no	Infrastructure and Link Roads	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes	However, the 2031 document will not deliver on 3.1 the aspiration to stop out commuting or the use of transport options other than cars. 2031 will result in gridlock, and a them and us culture. The document doesn't acknowledge how the huge additional use of resources like water will be coped with. We have drought now - and have 6000 less toilets to flush and washing machines to fill.	The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes	Bury St Edmunds sits at the centre of EA in easy reach of the main centres of the 3 counties (Cambridge, Norfolk & Suffolk). As such, it has a large influx of tourist which helps to sustain the viability of the town and the surrounding areas. I think its position is more than just a sub-regional centre.	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			yes	Infrastructure has to be improved across the board, whether in transport, utilities or services. Having aspiration is a very different thing to having improvements. The only thing that seems set in stone are houses.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 2: Key Challenges**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key challenges for the town between now and 2031?	Question 2b - Are there other significant challenges that have been missed? If so please state what they are and why you think they are significant?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	Yes - the need to move towards a more sustainable lifestyle. Reducing dependence on the car, growing more local food, encouraging local micro businesses.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Vehicular transport provides us all with mobility and liberty and this asset is unlikely to diminish with successive generations. Lets provide the infrastructure which will yield benefits for the tourist industry etc.	These issues are addressed elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			yes	Our green areas are just as important to relieving the stresses of everyday life. There needs to be due consideration to peoples needs outside of housing and employment.	An additional challenge has been inserted around the need to manage the impact of growth on the environment.	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	BUT the environment should have been placed at the heart of these challenges - sustainability, challenges to water supply, air quality, green spaces etc: quality of life is as important as any other issue	An additional challenge has been inserted around the need to manage the impact of growth on the environment.	Additional challenge 'H' inserted.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			<p>Breckland Council would have expected the documents to have included a policy similar to TH8 of the Thetford Area Action Plan (TAAP) and also an Access and Birds Monitoring Framework similar to that proposed and accepted as a minor modification to the Breckland Sites Specific DPD (sound and adopted) and which forms part of the Thetford Area Action Plan (TAAP) (Table 30.2, awaiting Inspector's Report). Indeed there is mention of Thetford Forest and its use by residents of the Borough at section 14.5 of the Bury St Edmunds Vision.</p> <p>Further to this, the Council does not understand why there is no mention in the documents of Stone Curlew, Woodlark or Nightjar. The Council considers that references should be included in section 3.8 of the Rural Vision where the key aspects of the natural environment are listed. There is also no reference to biodiversity or habitats in any of the 10 objectives in section 8 of the Rural Vision or in the 9 objectives in section 4 of the Bury St Edmunds Vision.</p>	This is specifically covered by Objective H of the Core Strategy and is indirectly referred to in Objective 5 of the Bury vision. Reference is made to the Breckland SPA and protected species in the Rural Vision and Bury Vision profile sections.	No changes required
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			<p>Breckland Council objects to both the Rural and Bury St Edmunds Vision on the grounds of a lack of a policy and monitoring framework on the potential impact of development in the Borough on protected European Sites through recreational and urban effects in combination with other plans and programmes.</p>	This is dealt with in Policy DM13 of the Development Management document	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	<p>St. Edmundsbury's objective should clearly be to ensure that all the residents of Bury St Edmunds, as it expands and faces the challenges of the next 20 years, have fair and equal access to a decent standard of life and to the amenities that the town offers. This means fair and equal access to appropriate housing, education, occupation, transport and healthcare as well as ensuring that the built and natural environment is accessible and sustainable. Vision 2031 is essential non-interventional, offering only to keep up with foreseen developments. A local authority should be offering more than that, otherwise what's the point of it?</p>	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Quentin Cornish				<p>Housing: the council must set local planning norms that result in sufficient housing that is really affordable (possibly up to 50% of the total), accessible to an ageing population, energy efficient and able to function in drought conditions with grey water harvesting.</p> <p>Education: new and existing schools must be accessible and connected by safe (segregated) cycle routes and bus routes.</p> <p>Occupation: housing developments must only be granted planning permission when there is sufficient local employment for the new residents. In 20 years' time car commuting may be unaffordable for anyone except highly paid professionals and so local employment is essential. I have no idea who will want to start businesses here that employ meaningful numbers of people, though, outside the current big employers. High tech companies will want to be nearer Cambridge, where new developments are advancing fast.</p>	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
	Quentin Cornish				<p>Transport: BSE residents will need electric buses to access the centre, which will need to be totally car free except for residents (whose access will be monitored remotely and automatically). There will never be a feasible system of buses from all the villages (too many) and so people from outside the town will need access to park and ride schemes, possibly in local remote collector hubs in outlying locations. Train links to east and west must be improved, with reliable, low carbon trains at least hourly in both directions, connecting seamlessly to London at Stowmarket / Ipswich and Cambridge (this implies electrification of the line, which the council should be pushing for now).</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Quentin Cornish				Healthcare: There is no indication that the district general hospital model will exist in 2031. The West Suffolk hospital is already an anomaly, duplicating services offered in bigger facilities in Ipswich and Cambridge. Any trend towards further specialisation in orthopaedics or general surgery may well disadvantage WSH and cause it to shrink, not need a "campus" (someone has swallowed WSH's propaganda there, I feel). An ageing population will need community and home based health and social care services; the growth of telecare and telemedicine may well obviate the need for hospital based outpatient departments. A DGH does not fit easily into this picture, which will be further complicated by the market based destruction of the national NHS that the current government claims it isn't undertaking (but is).	See above	No changes required
	Quentin Cornish				Natural environment: preserving and enhancing the natural environment is essential, although it may be too optimistic to base anything around the existing rivers as they will most likely have effectively become storm drains by 2031, fed only by runoff after heavy rain. Built environment: the highest quality of housing possible at the most affordable price should be the objective. More affordable (really affordable, not just slightly cheaper than average, using part purchase/part rent arrangements and other modified ownership arrangements if necessary), low energy, low water use housing is essential. All new houses must have grey water and rainwater harvesting systems. Hard surfaces must be minimised and "concreting over" of gardens disallowed to minimise runoff. All accommodation must contain areas or units that are fully accessible for people with disabilities or reduced mobility. The town centre must be totally car free except for residents.	See above	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	The Prince's Foundation identified the spectacular built environment as the most important positive asset of the town. Surely your top objective has to be preserving this built environment.	This is covered in objective 5.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	You are trying to avoid the cost of making any significant infrastructure improvements. Your only solution appears to be telling people to walk, cycle, or use the bus.	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Objective 5 cannot be met by the Vision 2031 proposals, as the developments are incompatible with the stated objective that development 'does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of Bury St Edmunds. Much concern has been expressed by residents of Westley and Fornham All Saints about coalescence with their villages and the local MP, Mr David Ruffley, has spoken out strongly against such coalescence. In the south-east region of Bury, the proposed development is ~50% located on part of a Special Landscape Area (SLA). Despite SEBC's contention to the contrary, urban sprawl over an area of Special Landscape cannot logically be claimed to retain its character. Furthermore, a major breach of the SLA's integrity will set an important precedent, likely to be used in future planning appeals by developers that would probably be impossible to resist.	Proposers of new developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure before development can proceed.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	There appears to be an attempt to avoid the cost of making any significant infrastructure improvements and the only solutions proposed are to tell people to walk, cycle, or use the bus.	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed in facing these challenges and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	The Society generally agrees with these statements, challenges and aspirations. However, the document should provide a broader indication of the timetable for new development. Will particular sites be prioritized or will several be developed in tandem - and how will the programme be monitored over the next nineteen years? We consider that these issues will have a major impact upon the town's ability to accommodate new development. A brief explanation of how the Core Strategy determined the town's original housing needs would also have been helpful.	Agree that more explanation on the background to the housing requirements should be set out in the document	New section on background to housing requirements included in all Vision documents
BVR15806	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust			None of the objectives refer to existing infrastructure and any potential deficiencies that may require improvement. For example Objective 9 seems self-evident - we suggest this objective (and others) could be more specific in what further educational opportunities are required. Ditto Objective 3, which isn't specific to Bury and could apply to any town or city in the UK. In any planning policy document the Objectives should be followed by policies that support the objectives, for consistency. There are objectives for homes, employment sites, retail, transport, climate change and education but none for leisure, health and wellbeing.	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues. Culture and Leisure has been inserted into Objective 4.	Amendment made to objective as stated.
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	There appears to be an attempt to avoid the cost of making any significant infrastructure improvements and the only solutions proposed are to tell people to walk, cycle, or use the bus.	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	You must continually review and act on facts and facts. More current than you currently have got.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	<p>These have been missed:</p> <p>Objective 1: Need to meet the needs of the projected population of single people too (not just elderly).</p> <p>Objective 3: infrastructure should specifically include roads, cycle ways and footpaths. They should be provided in advance of any development even if paid for by the developer.</p> <p>Objective 5: Need specifically to require green/open space buffer zones between existing and new developments and within new developments. Should mention Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 7: It is not sufficient merely to encourage public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. These must be required (see objective 3).</p>	<p>Objective 1 makes particular reference to an ageing population as well as the general population as this sector of the population will have particular housing needs.</p> <p>Objective 3 relates to all infrastructure, not just those stated. Buffer zones are dealt with in relation to the strategic sites elsewhere in the document. Public transport can only be encouraged as the council has no control over its provision and use.</p>	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	<p>One cannot agree with them as currently framed, as St Edmundsbury appears to be engaged in a process of fettering appropriate planning discretion.</p> <p>The presumption in this question is not accurate or fair because of the phrase 'to comply with planning law'. What aspect of planning law and whose interpretation is the pertinent question? There is a lack of clarity here and a failure to provide adequate legal reasoning. The Borough seems to be considering planning as of a presumed understanding at July 2011 but has fail to have regard to the fact that planning policy and legislation has developed and it has failed to demonstrate what the result of such actually changes actually are or may be.</p> <p>In fact the question here is further flawed since it contains the loaded phrase 'to comply with planning law'. More accurately it would say 'made under an interpretation of planning law according to certain officers at St Edmundsbury Borough Council' who have selected certain facts and issues to obtain a result but have disregarded other material facts and issues.</p>	<p>No explanation is given to support any objections to the objectives.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie				<p>Their interpretation is open to doubt and needs to be questioned.</p> <p>Further if this consultation is treated as legitimate and the Council intends to proceed in the role outlined by then Chief Executive Geoff Rivers on 23 March 2012, it will become necessary to explore further and investigate the precise connections and roles of those officers and councillors which are at this stage not clear or transparent and those who have made statements which amount to or give an appearance of predetermination. This will be necessary to understand precisely how the Borough has reached its claimed policy positions since the reasoning and strategy underlying them is so unclear and has been challenged on a number of grounds already.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Alan Murdie				<p>In short the wording of this question can be seen as an attempt to influence the answers, suggesting once again that there has been an element of predetermination underlying this whole exercise. At this stage, this can already be said to have succeeded to a degree since a number of councillors have made statements since this consultation began, indicating they have fundamentally misunderstood the position of a local planning authority and have in fact predetermined the issues.</p> <p>As a consequence, the presumption 'to comply with planning law' is in error since predetermination is wrong and the consultation is flawed as a result.</p> <p>Accordingly, the remainder of the questions are open to being perceived similarly flawed on the grounds of predetermination, a procedure unfairness and breach of legitimate expectations.</p> <p>All responses below incorporate the above statements.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Major infrastructure improvements required as well as trying to alter people's pattern of travel.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			We are in agreement that the draft objectives for the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 relate with the Strategic Spatial Objectives set out in the Core Strategy. We are particularly supportive of objectives 5 and 8.	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	The stated objectives (Page 22) are reasonable. With reference to Appendix 3 (Core Strategy Strategic Spatial Objectives) on Page 90, these also seem reasonable although Objectives A and B both refer to a 'continuous supply of land' which seems odd in a finite world - there are physical limits to growth.	The Core Strategy objectives are adopted and cannot be altered	No changes required
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		yes	We fully support Objective 1 but would add that you should include the word 'new' before the word 'housing' in the 4th line and also include the words - and specialist 'Care' accommodation - for an ageing population.	Consider objective as drafted adequately states approach to housing for an ageing population which may not always be new.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	We agree that this is a logical suite of objectives that matches our own analysis and community engagement feedback.	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	In general we concur with the plan objectives although there are important aspects of them which are of concern to us: Objective 1. This objective is to meet the housing needs of the town with particular emphasis on the provision of affordable housing and appropriate housing for an elderly population. In the SEBC Replacement Local Plan 2016 'Strategic Aim A' is defined as 'To meet the requirements for housing in such a way that is sustainable and will best serve the whole community.' (emphasis added). This important phrase was omitted from 'Strategic Objective A' in the adopted Core Strategy, and in Bury Vision 2031 emphasis has been placed on affordable housing and provision for the elderly - both of which we strongly support. However, as you make clear in paragraph 2.1 of the Bury Vision 2031, when house prices represent 3 to 3.5 times annual income they are generally considered affordable, but in Bury with prices averaging around £200,000 per dwelling this represents a ratio of 6.8 - excluding the possibility of all but the comparatively wealthy from buying a house.	Objective 1 makes particular reference to an ageing population as well as the general population as this sector of the population will have particular housing needs. Affordable housing is further dealt with in the homes and communities section of the document. Highway and transport issues are dealt with elsewhere in the document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			Action needs to be taken to address this very real problem. The starting point is to recognise it by amending Objective 1 so that the aim is to provide for the needs of all the community. Objectives 6 & 7. While we support these objectives, which cover access to the town centre and encouraging modes of sustainable transport, they fail to prioritise highway issues which will inevitably arise during the plan period. This problem will not be satisfactorily resolved by the promotion and use of sustainable transport modes alone, and express provision needs to be made for what is a land use issue.	See above	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Infrastructure requires much greater planning.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	<p>The objectives have not been clearly stated. Objective 1 discusses the need to meet the housing needs of Bury St Edmunds. No evidence on what the actual housing need has been put forward. It appears that the number of houses wanted is based on spurious data of people on the housing list and those that may want housing should the Suffolk Business Park flourish.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the majority of people base themselves close to their workplace and most therefore are prepared to commute regardless of any eco targets.</p> <p>Objective 5 discuss' the need to not compromise the natural and build up character of Bury St Edmunds. This certainly has not been fulfilled within this vision.</p> <p>Developments on the Westley, North East and Moreton Hall sites all interfere with the characters of existing hamlets.</p>	Agree that more explanation on the background to the housing requirements should be set out in the document.	New section on background to housing requirements included in all Vision documents
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	<p>The objectives have not been clearly stated. Objective 1 discusses the need to meet the housing needs of Bury St Edmunds. No evidence on what the actual housing need has been put forward. It appears that the number of houses wanted is based on spurious data of people on the housing list and those that may want housing should the Suffolk Business Park flourish.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the majority of people base themselves close to their workplace and most therefore are prepared to commute regardless of any eco targets.</p> <p>Objective 5 discuss' the need to not compromise the natural and build up character of Bury St Edmunds. This certainly has not been fulfilled within this vision.</p> <p>Developments on the Westley, North East and Moreton Hall sites all interfere with the characters of existing hamlets.</p>	Agree that more explanation on the background to the housing requirements should be set out in the document.	New section on background to housing requirements included in all Vision documents

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>Objective 1 - No real development really needed</p> <p>Objective 3 - Infrastructure should be put in place first, Now, to relieve the already crazy road delays, congestion and bottlenecks. This has not been a consideration in the past as the town is overdeveloped by greedy development companies with little or no regard to the environment or to those who will dwell here.</p> <p>Objective 4 - The Arc should be integrated into the Buttermarket to make 1 shopping centre not 2. The rates should be reviewed to allow small, independent businesses to take a foothold and the growth of mobile phone shops and charity shops halted as they overrun the town currently causing it to have no identity. It is not a destination for shoppers such is Norwich, Cambridge or Ipswich.</p>	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
	Mark Manning				<p>Objective 5 - Current development has meant the design of `modern` council estates which had their place back in the 60`s. No provision is ever really made for green spaces on development. Houses should be more spaced out with parking for more vehicles off road, creating better `street scenes`, with landscaping, etc. prominent. Making it a pleasant place to live. Larger front gardens with houses set back from the pathways</p> <p>Objective 6/7 - I take it this means no cars which is really short sighted in such a rural area. The fact the Council has ignored car ownership for so many years is probably why we face such congestion now.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15961	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes ltd			<p>The joint development team is positive about the Bury Vision 2031 document, indeed the Princes Foundation for the Built Environment has separately assisted the Council with community capital visioning following its involvement with the South East Growth Location and its Enquiry By Design process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the support for the broad themes and visions, many of which are based upon core values set out by the Princes Foundation, there are various points of clarification and review which should be addressed while the document is in draft form. This means that this Response Statement inevitably raises objection and comment but these points are very much intended to be read within the framework of the joint development team's support for what the Borough Council is trying to achieve.</p>	The broad support for the document is welcomed. Agree that clarification as to the documents planning status should be made. Objective 1 relates to all sectors of the population.	Include additional text in the introduction.
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes ltd			<p>Although the document is intended to be adopted as an "Area Action Plan" for Bury St Edmunds it does not arrive at this important conclusion until Appendix 1. Indeed, the entire text of this document seems to be deliberately avoiding this term.</p> <p>In addition to Objective 1, we believe that meeting the needs of families and young people should be prioritised particularly in view of the long term frame of the vision.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Basically the scale of development is too big for the town to carry but the objectives are acceptable for smaller development.	Additional text explaining the background to the housing requirement has been included. This growth is required to meet the needs of an increasing population.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes	Ensure the villages that are affected by the proposed new development retain their identity and remain rural.	These issues are dealt with in the section on the strategic growth areas.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton				<p>In the summary document it states: People can travel into Bury St Edmunds without relying on a car. Good, but this must be made into a reality. I suggest stronger wording in Objectives 6 and 7 to match this initial statement as follows:-</p> <p>After 'facilities' read: to reduce car use to a bare minimum. Delete: 'and encourage'.</p> <p>Attendance at the protest meeting at West Suffolk House on Thursday 26 April 2012 was almost exclusively confined to residents of the outer suburbs of Bury and surrounding villages. Only two of my 3500 electors were present. The reason is that most people who live inside Tollgate Lane and West Road can walk into town. The objectors are not really opposed to new housing or new people; it's the cars they fear. Their apocalyptic predictions will come true unless my proposals outlined above are implemented as early as possible. Late July is the best time to introduce this 'Big Bang' as the schools close for six weeks and people need to get accustomed to the changes and amend their travel plans accordingly.</p>	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no	<p>Objective 4:</p> <p>Objective 4 seeks to meet the shopping needs of residents of Bury St Edmunds and the wider sub-region. Reference is made to Core Strategy Objective E. In accordance with the Core Strategy and NPPF (which promotes a Town Centre first approach), Objective 4 should make explicit reference to meeting shopping needs in Bury St Edmunds Town Centre. The Town Centre first approach should then be supported by the individual policies and allocations.</p> <p>Objective 4 should be amended accordingly.</p>	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no	Objective 1. I still do not think that St Edmundsbury Council (SEBC) has made the case for the need for 500 homes per year for an extended period over the whole borough. To 'grow' the town will be to alter the character of existing town, and population growth in the area may have been the master plan of central government in the past, but has been amended by recent legislation (localism), and SEBC should amend its plans too. Objective 2. Provision of new employment sites is not necessary until existing employment sites are occupied. While a variety of types of sites is needed, I believe employers should be induced to consider existing sites before demanding new ones. Objective 3. Infrastructure is paramount to all development. New sites will not operate to good effect without full provision of functional infrastructure ie water, roads, electricity, gas, broadband and telephone lines, public transport service.	Agree that more explanation on the background to the housing requirements should be set out in the document. A range of employment sites are required to meet the differing needs of business and industry.	New section on background to housing requirements included in all Vision documents
	Jilly Jackson				Objective 4. People will shop where they want to go, and SEBC should be wary of thinking it can 'push' people into a certain course. Objective 5. SEBC cannot ensure safety, but planning and research may help provide a reasoned and informed policy or plan. Objective 6. SEBC cannot force residents to use facilities or travel in certain ways. It should aim to provide good facilities and usage may increase if it is successful. Objective 7. Yes Objective 8. Yes, SEBC needs to monitor very closely that development takes place in line with the rules agreed. It should not allow developers to 'cut corners' or implement a different plan after original plan approval without full consultation. Objective 9. Yes but SEBC cannot force the population to take up provision.	Comments are noted.	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The referencing within the Core Strategy relates closely to this Vision objectives. The infrastructure is required (for vehicles, pedestrians, cycles etc) needs to be developed and constructed before any new development. Core strategy I is fundamental	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Largely undeliverable for example, Objective 3. Ensure infrastructure is provided at the appropriate time. Developers won't accept that and we will be left with the usual jam tomorrow promises. Again, the car doesn't seem to exist	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR15983	Paul Elkin				Whilst endorsing the broad aims and objectives of this local plan, I have particular concerns in three areas:- Insufficient emphasis retaining the currently largely unspoilt open aspect of the Lark Valley and the river Lark itself to the south-east and north-east as one of the defining aspects of the town. Lack of planning control over 'the look' of retail premises and a coherent strategy for returning empty or unused upper stories above and/or behind many older town centre shops to residential use The need for better day-to-day maintenance of existing urban infrastructure and the finishing details of new developments	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	Objective 1 does not go far enough in identifying the wider range of accommodation and Care requirements needed for housing an ageing population and to being more specific in confirming that the Borough will allocate land and make specific provision for this significant need now and for the future.	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	<p>We welcome the recognition in objective 1 of the emphasis on meeting housing need. However, we consider it unnecessary to state there is a particular emphasis on affordable housing. The objective should be to meet the housing needs of all sections of society.</p> <p>Tackling climate change must be a key objective of the plan. The plan can influence impacts on climate change through the location of development to reduce car-borne travel. The plan should also support the provision of significant renewable energy capacity - at present the objectives appear to just present this is an issue in relation to design, whereas the key way the plan will tackle climate change will be to support the delivery of significant renewable energy capacity.</p>	Objective 1 relates to all sectors of the community. Environmental sustainability is covered in objective 9.	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Objective 1(3) should be ensuring the infrastructure is in place before any development takes place. Objective existing 1. We believe the provision of housing is not primarily for 'local' people but to encourage 'outsiders' to come in. Objective 8 Additional housing will use more water which is already in short supply.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Infrastructure must be sorted before any further development.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no		No explanation is given or alternative objectives suggested	No changes required
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust		yes	(h) We support the town having enhanced and new green infrastructure by 2031.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the commitment in these objectives to the issues presented by the ageing population, to protecting and improving access to the countryside, to developing sustainable transport options, to environmental sustainability and to access to education. We would suggest that the objectives could perhaps be improved as follows: Objective 5 could include a reference to enhancing the natural and built character of Bury St Edmunds, if that is not too close to the existing Core Strategy objective. Objective 6 might be improved by including reference to employment locations, alongside the town centre and other services and facilities, as employment land wouldn't generally be seen as a service or facility. Maybe reference could be made to sustainable connectivity of new developments both internally and to the town centre. Objective 8, by listing various environmental sustainability considerations, could be read as excluding considerations that aren't listed. It may be better to end the sentence at - addresses environmental sustainability issues', with the w	Objective 5 - it is considered that this is covered in the Core Strategy objectives. Objective 6 - agree with suggested change. Objective 8 - agree with suggested change.	Amendments made to objectives 6 and 8 as stated.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society is generally supportive of the objectives. In particular: Objective 1: The Society strongly supports the provision of adequate affordable housing and particularly housing for those with special needs such as the frail and the elderly; Objective 5: It is essential that new development does not compromise the rural setting and urban character of the town Objective 8: The Society believes that all new development must be of inherently sustainable construction. The Society believes that this objective should be expanded to give encouragement to innovative contemporary design that responds positively to context.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		We note that the objectives are drawn up based on the Core Strategy objectives. We support this approach, on the basis that the Vision 2031 must be prepared in conformity with the Core Strategy. That said, however, as the NPPF has now come into effect, we consider that these objectives should take account of the key objectives set out in the NPPF. We suggest therefore that Objective 2 is amended to read as follows: 'To maintain, develop and diversify the economic base, through the provision of employment sites to meet needs of the existing and future businesses.'	Agree with proposed revision	Objective 2 amended.
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Whilst many of the Draft Objectives are laudable in themselves and would equally suit the town even if there were more moderate growth, they have clearly been largely prepared to accommodate the Core Strategy and overall Vision concept of massive growth, which we oppose.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	Not adhered to LDF (September 2011) In the Preferred options on BV5 & SS94 So they do need to be repeated, as you have not adhered to policy in drawing up of the documents in BV5 & SS94. Each time a policy is published it seems to dilute to the developers favour.	No explanation is given or alternative objectives suggested	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	"Affordable" housing is not affordable to those trying to get onto the ladder. Council houses were the way to do this in the past but thanks to Thatcher many have been sold off. A feasible alternative to council homes must be introduced.	The affordable housing requirements are set out under Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. Further detail is also set out in the homes and communities section.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short				Yes. production of food, fuel and material needs to more local to Bury. Having safe, sustainable access to local shops only covers the retail end of the supply chain. The production end is often far away, requiring air, sea or road transport to reach our shops. Neither this production nor its transport is sustainable and safe, making us vulnerable to future changes.	Comments are noted. Agree with the sentiments expressed which is why the allocation of employment land close to residential areas is important in order to maximise the opportunity for this to happen.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	To include acceptable housing density strategy. and to ensure maximum home ownership	There is no minimum/maximum density requirement and this is looked at on a site by site basis.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Fully support this but it needs to be economically viable	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	To include acceptable housing density strategy. and to ensure maximum home ownership	There is no minimum/maximum density requirement and this is looked at on a site by site basis.	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	the assumption seems to be made that everyone will use buses and/or walk/cycle. Again, infrastructure changes are vital.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no	Objective 8 should include community woodland and biodiversity as part of the sustainability objective	Objective 8 has been broadened as when being specific there is a risk of individual projects being excluded from the list.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Cllr Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	Yes, in addition to affordable housing there needs to be specific requirements for intermediate Housing and low Cost market housing. Complete lack of significant improvements to infrastructure. For reasons stated in Q1 it is not always possible or desirable to walk, cycle or take the bus.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	no content for mid to lower incomes. no content for original home ownership no content for charitable groups	The objectives identified are, by necessity little more than the headline issues. The sentiments expressed acknowledge a range of issues which need to be addressed and the following chapters seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	MUST CONTINUALLY REVIEW DATA AND NOT TAKE WHAT WAS GOOD 3 YEARS AGO AS A FEEL FOR THE FUTURE. REVIEW & AMEND	Whilst the Vision document plans for the period to 2031 it will be reviewed well before the end of the plan period.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	There appears to be an attempt to avoid the cost of making any significant infrastructure improvements and the only solutions proposed are to tell people to walk, cycle, or use the bus.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The plans for the road infrastructure are not radical enough. Encouraging vast numbers of people to use buses, cycle or walk is just not practical. When it is wet and parents have to take children to several schools and get to work they simply can not walk. Cycling up Mount Road with shopping, a brief case and work files is not easy especially in the rain with children - I have tried it. Have you?	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no		No explanation is given or alternative challenges suggested	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Road infrastructure is not widen enough as it does not allow for the MASSIVE increase in traffic Flow. Over and Above the A14 Junctions.	Infrastructure is covered by objective 3 and is dealt with elsewhere in the document	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop				Concern over the impact to our Lane and to our village with the increased traffic the development would make. Making Westley Lane a 'Rat Run' and increasing vehicles along a country road.	Further detail on the strategic site is set out in section 16 of the document.	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I do agree objective 1 but believe the 2031 document will not deliver it. I do not agree objective 5. The 2031 document will destroy the countryside and lead to Bury becoming a series of ever widening housing estates, empty during the day because their occupants all work in London or Cambridge.	The comments are noted	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes	objective 5/8 - ensuring that the environment created in new developments encourage healthy and active lifestyles.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objective for Bury St Edmunds?	Question 3b - Taking into account the fact that, to comply with planning law, these objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	For the most part, they are fine but Objective 3 is too vague. The phrase "at the appropriate time" is open to interpretation and debate. When is it appropriate to provide, say, playing fields - before houses are built, whilst or after - and who decides when the time is appropriate? I would like to see this strengthened to say that any required infrastructure should be in place before development takes place or forms an integral part of any development plan. Promises to build infrastructure subsequent to the completion of any housing must not be accepted and, if possible, stated within the necessary objectives / strategy.	It is not feasible or economically viable to require all infrastructure to be provided up front as the funds from the development itself are required to fund to the infrastructure. The time that various types of infrastructure are required will vary depending on the site and type of infrastructure needed.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	The core strategy objectives MUST be a condition never to be waived to a developer.	The objectives help to inform the planning policies which are the enforceable element of any planning document.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	BUT the environment - on which everything depends is again not mentioned	This is covered in objective 5.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	<p>All new housing developments must be connected to the centre of town by frequent buses (probably electric); probably the only way to ensure this would be for the council to subsidise them. Cycle-routes are fine but inappropriate for an ageing population; where built, they must be completely separate from roads otherwise they are unsafe and thus useless. The concept of local "village" [wrong word - villages cannot occur in towns, and this is just a planner's twee conceit] is flawed in that local shops are not what people want - they want the supermarkets, the market and the big shops. Local pubs are fine, and local primary schools. The existing local precincts in BSE are generally sad places where prices are high - they are "walkable", but why would anyone want to?</p> <p>The important thing for the council is to be proactive in setting planning expectations along these lines and then enforcing them through the planning system. The proposals to "encourage", "facilitate" and "work with" are simply inadequate for the challenges outlined above at Q2.</p>	The comments here appear to relate to other sections of the documents and do not relate to the question asked.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no	<p>NO I don't agree with this policy, I fundamentally disagree with it. We are far too accepting the need to infill every available green space with more housing.</p> <p>If we accept this level of urban sprawl, what happens next time?</p> <p>Insufficient effort is placed on the redevelopment of brown field sites, such as the area around the gas holder and railway station.</p> <p>Villages get swallowed up and loose their identity.</p> <p>You far too readily accept the easy option of building on greenfields</p>	The Policy states that development would only occur where a proposal didn't conflict with other policies. The policy does not allow for development regardless of impact as long as it is located with the Housing Settlement Boundary. The document seeks to allocate Brownfield sites for redevelopment, and one of the sites includes the gas holder. The Core Strategy seeks to protect the identity of villages around the town which are located near strategic areas of growth.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	<p>Firstly, you say that you are planning an extra 5,900 new homes in the town between 2011 and 2031 (p.23). This is a very large number and is far more than the infrastructure and character of the town can cope with.</p> <p>Secondly, the population of Bury St Edmunds was 38,299 in 2011 (information supplied by Suffolk County Council) and you say the population of the town is estimated to be 43,600 in 2031 (p.23). That means you anticipate the population will grow by 5,300 by 2031. So you are planning to build 5,900 new homes for an extra 5,300 people! I appreciate that there has been a rise in single person households, but that is a ridiculously large number of houses to accommodate the planned growth! You really do not need to build that many houses.</p> <p>Thirdly, your policies on housing make no reference to the quality of the housing.</p>	Housing numbers are set in the adopted Core Strategy. Policies with the emerging Development Management Document deal with design of houses.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	<p>You are overdeveloping the NE, Moreton Hall and SE areas of the town. These areas will be effectively interlinked but do not have the infrastructure to support them. They will each plough more traffic into existing black spots. The proposed link roads will not solve the problem. Sort out additional access to the A14 and town centre before carrying out any more development</p>	<p>The directions of growth for the town were set with the adopted Core Strategy. Their development will require infrastructure changes to accommodate the growth. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. Additional access points to the A14 will not be permitted by the Highways Agency, but improvements to the Rookery Crossroads junction (45) and the provision of the eastern relief Road will provide a realistic alternative.</p>	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	<p>Policy BV1 is in direct conflict with Policy 4b of the Development Management document that was consulted upon earlier in 2012. That policy states that new development will only be permitted where 'it will not result in the irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a)'. It is certain that the greenfield land in the SE Bury region is Grade 3a, and the same is probably true for the other greenfield sites proposed. We are advised that SEBC will circumvent this 'inconvenient truth' by simultaneous adoption of the Development Management and Vision 2031 documents, but it is exactly this sort of administrative manoeuvre that undermines public confidence in and respect for the planning process. Furthermore, the proposed massive expansion onto greenfield sites is directly contrary to views raised in the Core Strategy consultation about coalescence, overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the strategic growth areas will use higher grade agricultural land. There is no lower grade land around Bury St Edmunds. However, this does not conflict with the emerging Development Management Document as the policy referred to relates to countryside outside the housing settlement boundary. The land identified for strategic growth in the Core Strategy and located within the housing settlement boundary by this policy will not be classified as countryside.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>No convincing case has been made that there is a genuine need for this level of growth.</p> <p>The NE, Moreton Hall and SE areas of the town are to be overdeveloped. These areas will be effectively interlinked but do not have the infrastructure to support them. In particular they will each create more traffic at existing black spots. The proposed link roads will not solve the problems. Additional access to the A14 and town centre should be provided before carrying out any more development</p> <p>Paragraph 5:10 refers to a 'minimum' number of homes at each location which represents a change of the wording from the Core Strategy which refers to 'around' and a stated number of homes and is not acceptable.</p>	The adopted Core Strategy sets the level of growth around the town and is not being reviewed in this document. Do not accept the concept that Moreton Hall is overdeveloped. The development of strategic sites will require infrastructure changes to accommodate the growth. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. Additional access points to the A14 will not be permitted by the Highways Agency, but improvements to the Rookery Crossroads junction (45) and the provision of the eastern relief Road will provide a realistic alternative. Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	<p>The Society supports concept that new sites will be 'village' neighbourhoods to promote strong communities. We also welcome 'walkable' access to local shops or schools for day to day needs. However, we consider there should be a more pro-active approach to promote a wider variety of housing densities and stimulate imaginative house design.</p> <p>We would also ask for some smaller parcels of land to be earmarked within these larger sites to encourage diversity of design. Perhaps these sites could be developed by local builders or self build groups, so that we are less dependent upon national house builders. Society suggests document should call for strategic planting to be implemented prior to start of construction works.</p>	Support is welcomed and the comment relating to self build is accepted. Requiring planting before development commences cannot be a requirement of the local planning authority, but will be encouraged wherever feasible.	Add text in the concept statements that seeks opportunities to facilitate self build opportunities
	Christopher Anderson	Westley Village and Westley Parish Council			<p>In fact, it is the housing numbers that need to be expressed as 'aspirational' with phased housing starts conditional on SEBC (and our Government representatives) having delivered on the firm targets for the other interdependent themes. Hard metrics for each of the ten key themes need to be articulated, and dependencies framed, with any of these being able to stall growth without satisfactory progress.</p> <p>We would propose that the plans need to have frequent holistic reviews with 'gating', or go/no go decisions if the wider aspects of the plan are not being met. For example:</p> <p>'Phased housing starts to be conditional on targets for employment growth being met;</p> <p>'Likewise for road congestion, infrastructure (water supplies), transport links (including upgrading rail network), green spaces etc;</p> <p>'SEBC needs to be expressly accountable for delivering all aspects of the plan.</p>	Housing numbers are set in the adopted Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Anderson	Westley Village and Westley Parish Council			We are also concerned that the nature of the process has been driven to suit large developers who can make substantial financial incentives available to landowners, and whose profitability depends on the mass production and repeatability of 'cookie-cutter' designs. What has happened, for example, to the aspirations for some self-build homes, or has this been devolved to rural communities in the clamour to build as many houses as possible in the tight confines of Bury St Edmunds? See also our response to Q.15. Recommendation 1: SEBC to publish and explain the housing evidence base within 2031. Recommendation 2: Explain why the idea of a completely new settlement has not been considered. Recommendation 3: That, in its next iteration, Vision 2031 should make much clearer links between the housing and other themes, and should phase any development so that it meets local employment needs, provides a more substantial proportion of affordable homes and links new development to genuine improvements in the local transport infrastructure.	Although the delivery of sites is likely to rest with large developers, this is driven by the nature of the development industry in this country, not this document. The Concept Statements for each of the strategic growth areas seeks to address design and the creation of desirable neighbourhoods. where applicable, this also encourages the provision of self build homes. Housing numbers are addressed in the adopted Core Strategy and the concept of a new settlement was explored in the early stages of the preparation of the Core Strategy.	No changes required
	Christopher Anderson	Westley Village and Westley Parish Council			Without these modifications, the Parish Council recommends a wider review of the development needs of Bury St Edmunds. The Council does not accept the view that the requirement for housing is a given starting point in the context of planning for the future of the town. SEBC has every right to review the development of the town holistically without assuming that such a major expansion of population is inevitable and the Parish Council recommends that SEBC should listen to local voices and the concerns expressed across the Borough about this key assumption and should respond to them.		
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			no	The Prime Minister stated that there would be NO greenfield development under his new ACT of Paliament but Westley development is all greenfield as the farmer still sets the field with crops.	Whatever the Prime Minister may have said, this has not been followed up with legislation.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	<p>No convincing case has been made that there is a genuine need for this level of growth.</p> <p>The NE, Moreton Hall and SE areas of the town are to be overdeveloped. These areas will be effectively interlinked but do not have the infrastructure to support them. In particular they will each create more traffic at existing black spots. The proposed link roads will not solve the problems. Additional access to the A14 and town centre should be provided before carrying out any more development</p> <p>Paragraph 5:10 refers to a 'minimum' number of homes at each location which represents a change of the wording from the Core Strategy which refers to 'around' and a stated number of homes and is not acceptable.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. Do not accept the concept that Moreton Hall is overdeveloped. The development of strategic sites will require infrastructure changes to accommodate the growth. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. Additional access points to the A14 will not be permitted by the Highways Agency, but improvements to the Rookery Crossroads junction (45) and the provision of the eastern relief Road will provide a realistic alternative. Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	The word Minimum of new homes is of grave concern. All other policy documents have been in the region of / circa. The wording MUST be constant and not continually change from document / policy to document to policy / document in favour of the developers and increased houses.	Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	To avoid a developer's charter, 'will be permitted' should be changed to residential planning permission 'may be permitted' (even if it is not contrary to other planning policies).	All government advice at present, contained within the NPPF is advising that policies must be positive to encourage development. The wording suggested would fail this test.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	See answers to questions 1-3 above. Need to consider landscape, heritage and archaeological issues.	landscape, heritage and archaeological issues are all of relevance in the consideration of any applications for development. Further requirements can be found in the emerging Development Management Policies document.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Taken as a whole, gross overdevelopment. Some smaller parts of plan would be OK.	The adopted Core Strategy sets the level of growth around the town and is not being reviewed in this document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	<p>The Vision 2031 document recognises, quite rightly, that the major themes (e.g. homes, jobs, environment, and infrastructure) are interconnected. However, there seems to be no measures proposed to regularly review the progress of each of these elements and adjust the plans accordingly.</p> <p>We feel that the document is 'long' on the plans for housing, but 'short' on how all of the other key factors will be met. Our fear is that the green light will be granted for all of the housing but that the expressed aspirations for the other vital elements will become rhetoric; and for example, the transport infrastructure developments and the provision of green spaces will be overlooked.</p> <p>In fact, it is the housing numbers that need to be expressed as 'aspirational' with phased housing starts conditional on SEBC (and our Government representatives) having delivered on the firm targets for the other interdependent themes.</p>	<p>Housing numbers are set in the adopted Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. The council has a statutory requirement to maintain a 5 year housing supply and it is not in a position to withhold development because of the failure of another policy target such as employment growth. However, the infrastructure requirements mentioned above are material considerations.</p>	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				<p>Hard metrics for each of the ten key themes need to be articulated, and dependencies framed, with any of these being able to stall growth without satisfactory progress. We would propose that the plans need to have frequent holistic reviews with 'gating', or go/no go decisions if the wider aspects of the plan are not being met. For example:</p> <p>Phased housing starts to be conditional on targets for employment growth being met;</p> <p>Likewise for road congestion, infrastructure (water supplies), transport links (including upgrading rail network), green spaces etc;</p> <p>SEBC needs to be expressly accountable for delivering all aspects of the plan.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the nature of the process has been driven to suit large developers who can make substantial financial incentives available to landowners, and whose profitability depends on the mass production and repeatability of cookie-cutter designs.</p>	<p>Although the delivery of sites is likely to rest with large developers, this is driven by the nature of the development industry in this country, not this document. The Concept Statements for each of the strategic growth areas seeks to address design and the creation of desirable neighbourhoods.</p>	

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				What has happened, for example, to the aspirations for some self-build homes, or has this been devolved to rural communities in the clamour to build as many houses as possible in the tight confines of Bury St Edmunds? See also our response to Q.15. Recommendation 1: SEBC to publish and explain the housing evidence base within 2031. Recommendation 2: Explain why the idea of a completely new settlement has not been considered. Recommendation 3: That, in its next iteration, Vision 2031 should make much clearer links between the housing and other themes, and should phase any development so that it meets local employment needs, provides a more substantial proportion of affordable homes and links new development to genuine improvements in the local transport infrastructure. Without these modifications, the Parish Council recommends a wider review of the development needs of Bury St Edmunds.	Where applicable, the concept statements encourage the provision of self build homes. Housing numbers are addressed in the adopted Core Strategy and the concept of a new settlement was explored in the early stages of the preparation of the Core Strategy.	
	Chris Anderson				The Council does not accept the view that the requirement for housing is a given starting point in the context of planning for the future of the town. SEBC has every right to review the development of the town holistically without assuming that such a major expansion of population is inevitable and the Parish Council recommends that SEBC should listen to local voices and the concerns expressed across the Borough about this key assumption and should respond to them.		
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood			The settlement boundary of Bury St. Edmunds should be re-drawn to include the whole of Nowton Park and Nowton Court within the urban boundary of the town as the Park fulfils the role as an urban green space benefiting the residents on the south and south-eastern side of Bury St. Edmunds touching as it does the existing town boundary. The Park does not fill a rural role, is not in agriculture and more appropriately seeks to fulfil a role of functions for the benefit of the inhabitants of the urban area of Bury St. Edmunds and should be properly classified, allocated and defined within the boundary of the Borough. This is even more so given that the potential strategic housing releases contemplated for the south-east sector of Bury St Edmunds.	The purpose of the housing settlement boundary is to define where new development will be permitted. Nowton Park is deliberately located outside of the Housing Settlement Boundary as it is an important recreational parkland which should be protected from development.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While we agree with the proposed policy for housing development within the settlement boundary for Bury St Edmunds, it is out of place on its own in this plan. It should have been included in Chapter 5, Housing and Homes in the Joint Development Management Policies Preferred Options Document (DPMD), January 2012. The draft DPMD requires a single over-arching housing policy so that it is immediately clear what in general is required of applicants. The present position with housing policy (as distinct from land allocations for housing) split between the two plans is thoroughly confusing for potential applicants. Policies for major land uses such as housing should be drafted in a manner which is joined-up in order to assist the users which they are intended to help.	The confusion arising from policies being contained within different documents is acknowledged. However, the two documents should be read in parallel. The correct place for policies of a strategic nature such as this is the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Far too much over development we are reaching the tipping point.	There is no definition of a tipping point in this context.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no	I do not want to see any more development as it is spoiling the countryside	Development needs to be accommodated to meet the needs of the population.	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15948	David Evans				Cllr. Griffiths comments in the forward that our challenge is to shape and accommodate this growth while protecting the qualities of the town and its environs that attracts people to live here sums up exactly what we all want to see and if we are unable to achieve this growth without doing so then we must reconsider the whole project. 5.7 core strategy provision for 5900 homes is based on a number of assumptions that may never happen and the Council must bear in mind throughout that, as very sensibly stated in Asporation 1.6.3 we just don't know what the demands will be in 2013. We well remember that 45 years ago everyone expected that, by now, retirement would be 55 at the latest as modern technology would eliminate many jobs but, of course, the opposite has happened. Finally, we also remember that in the fifties the Borough made a brilliant job of bringing high quality employers into the town as part of the London overspill scheme.	It is quite correct that growth will need to be reviewed during the plan period, as changes in forecasts will change during that period. However, we must plan for the future based on the information we have now.	No changes required
	David Evans				We knew a number of the employers who moved in and we know that they were motivated to come to Bury because it was a lovely place for their families and their employees to live. The same will apply to any future development and if we are to provide anything like 5900 homes we shall need a number of high quality large employers so it is absolutely vital that areas like Hardwick Lane, Sharp Road, Home Farm Lane and Hardwick Park Gardens are protected	Bury St Edmunds remains an attractive town which people choose as a place to live. Whereas the retirement age may have gone in the opposite direction from that expected in the fifties, the fact remains that people are living longer and household sizes have decreased, resulting in a need for more houses even before any net inward migration.	
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15951	Mollie Evans				Cllr. Griffiths comments in the foreward that our challenge is to shape and accommodate this growth while protecting the qualities of the town and its environs that attracts peope to live here sums up exactly what we all want to see and if we are unable to achieve this growth without doing so then we must reconsider the whole project. 5.7 core strategy provision for 5900 homes is based on a number of assumptions that may never happen and the Council must bear in mind throughout that, as very sensibly stated in Asporation 1.6.3 we just don't know what the demands will be in 2013. We well remember that 45 years ago everyone expected that, by now, retirement would be 55 at the latest as modern technology would eliminate many jobs but, of course, the opposite has happened. Finally, we also remember that in the fifties the Borough made a brilliant job of bringing high quality employers into the town as part of the London overspill scheme.	It is quite correct that growth will need to be reviewed during the plan period, as changes in forecasts will change during that period. However, we must plan for the future based on the information we have now.	No changes required
	Mollie Evans				We knew a number of the employers who moved in and we know that they were motivated to come to Bury because it was a lovely place for their families and their employees to live. The same will apply to any future development and if we are to provide anything like 5900 homes we shall need a number of high quality large employers so it is absolutely vital that areas like Hardwick Lane, Sharp Road, Home Farm Lane and Hardwick Park Gardens are protected.	Bury St Edmunds remains an attractive town which people chhose as a place to live. Whereas the retirement age may have gone in the opposite direction from that expected in the fifties, the fact remains thatpeople are living longer and household sizes have decreased, resulting in a need for more houses even before any net inward migration.	
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	Para 5.10 quotes the word Minimum. From the start of this consultation process the number of houses required has gradually risen after each step of the consultation. It is surely bad practice to allow a minimum rather than insist on a maximum number of houses. The number of houses required is unclear no evidence on what the actual housing need has been put forward. It appears that the number of houses wanted is based on spurious data of people on the housing list and those that may want housing should the Suffolk Business Park flourish. It is unlikely that the majority of people base themselves close to their workplace and are prepared to commute regardless	Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	Para 5.10 quotes the word Minimum. From the start of this consultation process the number of houses required has gradually risen after each step of the consultation. It is surely bad practice to allow a minimum rather than insist on a maximum number of houses. The number of houses required is unclear no evidence on what the actual housing need has been put forward. It appears that the number of houses wanted is based on spurious data of people on the housing list and those that may want housing should the Suffolk Business Park flourish. It is unlikely that the majority of people base themselves close to their workplace and are prepared to commute regardless	Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	No convincing case has been made that there is a genuine need for this level of growth. The NE, Moreton Hall and SE areas of the town are already overdeveloped. These areas will be effectively interlinked but do not have the infrastructure to support them. In particular they will each create more traffic at existing black spots. The proposed link roads will not solve the problems. Additional access to the A14 and town centre should be provided before carrying out any more development Paragraph 5:10 refers to a 'minimum' number of homes at each location which represents a change of the wording from the Core Strategy which refers to 'around' and a stated number of homes and is not acceptable. No development in this area should be entered into.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. Do not accept the concept that Moreton Hall is overdeveloped. The development of strategic sites will require infrastructure changes to accommodate the growth. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. Additional access points to the A14 will not be permitted by the Highways Agency, but improvements to the Rookery Crossroads junction (45) and the provision of the eastern relief Road will provide a realistic alternative. Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15961	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes ltd					
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Basically the scale of development is too big for the town to carry but the objectives are acceptable for smaller development.	The adopted Core Strategy sets the level of growth around the town and is not being reviewed in this document.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no	See attached PDF		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	I would like the number of proposed new houses to be built reduced and the proposed new boundaries moved back. I refer to page 24 of the Vision 2031 - 5.10 'careful planning is required to ensure that merging with any nearby village does not occur' There must be more space between the proposed new developments and the existing villages. Villages must retain their identity and remain rural.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. The nature of protection to prevent villages merging with the town is addressed in greater detail in the Concept Statements for the strategic growth sites.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Numbers are less important once the travel plan is adopted	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no	I believe that SEBC should re-consider the long term housing need in the area in line with Central Government re-thinking, and gauge whether 500 homes a year are really needed in the borough. If it is found that this level of housing is needed, then looking at the map of BSE and SEBC's stated aim to encourage walking and cycling, then development should be sought to the north and to the south of the town centre. Therefore the South East BSE site is a prime one, and investigation/incentive should be made to release the brown field are to the north of the town centre currently occupied by the sugar beet factory.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. Development is proposed in the areas suggested, but there are significant infrastructure issues which will need to be addressed in respect of the SE area.	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	Due to the extent of the proposed new developments, a new village should be created along the A14 corridor between Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket. Bury St Edmunds cannot cope with all the additional traffic that the housing development would create.	This option was considered early in the preparation of the Core Strategy and dismissed.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	There is no key to the diagram under this question and therefore the interpretation will be different (blue to green areas and the intentions of these areas; development to strategic landscaping!) Further references within this document, ie page 80 reference 16.23 to 16.26 inclusive provides greater clarity. This is misleading and does provide a concern over the thoroughness of this document. To allay fears these areas need to be definitive and consistent within any document especially for neighbouring settlements To comply with Core Strategy on neighbouring settlements the provision of the infrastructure and strategic buffer is paramount.	The clarification being sought is now included in the policies map, which excludes the strategic landscape areas from the housing settlement boundary. Further guidance can be found in the concept statements for the strategic growth areas.	Ensure Policies Maps are clear

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Explain how the word 'minimum' has been allowed to be included in Para 5.10 on Page 24, that now reads; 'The principle of growing the town in in 5 directions has already been agreed in the adopted Core Strategy where Policy CS11 sets out their locations around the town and the minimum numbers of new homes each strategic site will provide.'</p> <p>Minimum was not part of policy CS11 and cannot be passed off as a typographical error. To include it in this document must be seen as an attempt to increase the numbers across the board and must be investigated.</p>	Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	5.10 states that you are already going to build in the allocated areas, so why are you doing this consultation? You are not allowing green space between 'Bury' and 'Fornham All Saints'.	The revised document specifically draws the housing settlement boundary to exclude the green space.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	<p>The aspirations should include delivering at least 6,350 new homes by 2031.</p> <p>We do not agree that the main way the plan can influence affordability is to assist registered providers in building new homes. The main way the plan can influence affordability is to deliver the new homes required by the Core Strategy and to put in place a plan which facilitates early delivery and does not impose significant burdens which will add to the cost of delivery.</p> <p>Action c) should be amended to refer to working with the housing industry to deliver new homes.</p> <p>Action d) should be amended to refer to providing a range of housing to meet, rather than simply be related to downsizing.</p>	It is acknowledged that delivery of affordable housing requires the delivery of open market as well as social affordable housing. A range of housing is also required.	Amend actions associated with Aspiration 1 to include working with developers as well as registered housing providers and broaden the range of housing to be provided.
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no	A by pass is essential before anymore development is allowed to come out onto the 143. Congestion at peak times in and out of Bury is considerable already.	Policy CS11 of the adopted Core Strategy does not require a By Pass to be provided but requires the strategic area of growth to "facilitate the provision of"	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Moreton Hall already overdeveloped. Proposed development of 588 homes will generate at least 588 more cars (possibly 750+). In addition the proposed development of 1250 near Great Barton will also have a serious detrimental effect.	Do not accept the concept that Moreton Hall is overdeveloped. If properly managed, additional development need not result in a detrimental impact. If the reason for journeys is altered, such as the location of secondary schools, then journey patterns may change.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler				Will Bury need 4,250 new houses? Population statistics and projections for 2031 would have been very helpful in making a reasoned conclusion. You hold the relevant statistics from census information so why were they not published and compared to pre-2001 data? What are residential conversion schemes and their effects?	Yes. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	Accept that this is a challenge, but the option of a new settlement was considered and dismissed at an early stage in the preparation of the Core strategy which was adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not have any comment to make on this question at this time.	Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that a stronger policy link needs to be developed between housing supply, local need and employment growth. This approach would be inherently more sustainable. Instead of simply building speculative housing such housing growth would then be directly responsive to the actual needs of the population of the town with phasing allowing housing land supply to be fine tuned to meet the prevailing circumstances. The Society believes that CS11 of the Core Strategy fails to demonstrate conformity with the principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. In particular, the Vision needs to address the over-dependence of residents on out-commuting to work; whilst growth in population and households needs to provide an evidence-based trigger for the phased release of housing sites. The Society reiterates the need for the existing highway related capacity issues to be resolved including the capacity of the A14 junctions.	Although it pre-dates the NPPF, Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy was found sound at the examination in public in 2010. The council has a statutory requirement to maintain a 5 year housing supply and it is not in a position to withhold development or introduce its own phasing requirements because of the failure of another policy target such as employment growth. People will continue to choose Bury St Edmunds as a place to live, whether for retirement, or because house prices are cheaper than cities such as Cambridge, where they work. We cannot prevent this, but we can redress the balance by improving employment opportunities within the town to reduce the amount of out commuting.	No changes required
	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society wishes to highlight that priority must be afforded to bringing forward brownfields sites first to prevent leap-frogging by developers to greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement. Such sites are inevitably less sustainable and promote more trips to access goods and services. A more robust framework is required if developers are to be completed to develop the significant areas of brownfield potential identified in the Vision. Such an approach would increase the market value of such sites, thereby improving their viability.	Brownfield development is encouraged, but opportunities are limited, particularly in the current economic climate, due to the typically higher costs of development.	

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The centralised approach to the delivery of employment land at the Suffolk Business Park will also serve to promote unsustainable trip generation in comparison with a dispersed approach to employment sites. If such sites were more closely related to the pattern of housing growth with genuinely mixed use schemes (real urban villages) then the congestion experienced at peak hours could be mitigated with a reduction in travel to work distances. This would also promote greater urban vitality and distinctive places as opposed to suburban housing estates.	Employment provision is being accommodated for throughout the town, including within the strategic growth areas. In addition, a strong and vibrant town centre provides significant employment opportunities. However, there remains a requirement for large scale commercial buildings to serve a sub-regional role and the extension to Suffolk Business Park will serve this role. It will be important, however, to ensure that this area is accessible to other parts of the town by means other than the private car.	
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process.		no	We object to the Town being classed and promoted as a growth area and do not wish to see an expanded town of the order proposed. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings to be built to more moderate levels, for the following reasons: Residents' Wishes. As stated in our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011 [copy attached], we strongly disagree with the expansion of Bury St. Edmunds and the building of at least 6,350 homes between 2009 and 2031 [item 5.7, page 23]. The number 1 concern of residents from the last round of consultation [item 1.31, bullet point 1, page 10 of 'Vision'] was that 'the town will be over-developed and crowded housing will result' and also that that 'there is worry about expansion of the town and the impact it may have in fringe areas on surrounding villages' [item 1.31, bullet point 3]. These views have been totally ignored.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			Core Strategy Page 24, item 5.10 of Vision and the introduction to The Strategic Growth Areas on page 75, state that as the development sites and numbers of houses to be built have already been set in the Core Strategy, they are not up for debate. This is particularly worrying and cannot be the right course of action to take. Expansion of the Town is the prime concern of residents. Only now, as details of the 5 proposed housing expansion areas are launched and residents are contacted by the developers, are some residents becoming aware of what is proposed. Many, if not most, of the residents outside of the development areas are oblivious of the proposals and how they might affect the Town as a whole. We doubt very much if the overwhelming majority of residents know what the Core Strategy is and what it contains. Policies are made and can be changed. The Core Strategy and Vision document should be revisited and expansion plans changed to accord with residents' wishes.		
	Michael Schultz				Consultation We are particularly concerned, that even though we are sure there must have been a range of consultation initiatives on the Core Strategy, there nevertheless appears to have been a lack of meaningful, ground-roots contact with the residents of the Town on the principal subject of population and housing growth. Perhaps initiatives should have been taken to seek their views in line with good practice, such as doorstep and telephone surveys and the delivery of simple leaflets to each home outlining the key points with the expansion plans at the top of the list? Leaflets incorporating a simple survey tick return form could have been delivered with other mail being delivered by the Council such as Council tax demands. A leaflet was given out with the hard copies of the Vision Documents, but only on request. To go ahead on such an important subject without the broad approval of Bury residents is not democratic.		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>Growth and Housing Target Figures Bury St. Edmunds was made a 'growth area' by the East Of England Regional Authority and the Council given housing number targets, without consulting, to our knowledge with the people of the town. The Authority clearly required an escalation in annual build number targets. Item 2.4, page 14 of Vision says that 4400 homes were built over the last 20 years equalling an average of 220pa. Item 5.7, page 23 says that a minimum of 5900 homes are to be built between 2011 and 2031 giving an average of 295pa, an increase over previous years of 34%. Indeed, this is further confirmed in Item 3.3.3, page 9 of the Habit Regulations Assessment where it is proposed that the number of houses be increased from 17,800 in 2009 to 24,230, an increase of 35%. This aligns with a similar proposed growth in population from 37,000 to 50,000, page 58, item 11.3 of Vision. However, the growth over the past 25 years to 2007 in the Borough as a whole has only been 14,500 or 16.5% rising from 88,400 in 1982 to 102,900 in 2007.</p>		
	Michael Shultz				<p>The expansion plans seem to have allowed for more than double that which may be expected from a naturally rising population. This does needs explaining. Having said this, relying on statistical figures that can change according to the criteria and assumptions set , is highly contentious for such a major undertaking.</p> <p>No Legal Obligation on Housing Targets The East of England Regional Authority has now been abolished along with the housing targets so there is no legal requirement to follow them any longer. However, the Council has made no modification whatsoever to the targets even though the Inspector, in his report of 24th August 2010 on the Core Strategy, stated that 'I have concluded my report on the basis of those [targets] in the former Regional Spatial Strategy. It would be open for the Council to undertake a focused partial revision of the Core Strategy in due course should it wish to revisit any of these matters'.</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>Parkinson's Law Item 7.1 Page 46 of Vision suggests that improving roads only attracts more traffic. Similarly, by promoting the town as a growth area, incomers will be attracted to the town and will fill the expanded housing provision, whatever the requirements of local people. There would then be a treadmill of building houses to keep up with the demand from outside Bury. There is a natural level that can be attained for the town and the population will self-regulate to the number of houses available.</p> <p>7. Housing Types and Density Whatever development is finally approved for the Town, it must include a mix of various type of dwellings that not only includes affordable housing and smaller/intermediate properties but larger, low density family/executive houses on larger plots with decent sized front and rear gardens. Such actions would meet the aspirations of families wishing to trade upwards and the demands of the housing market for larger properties. The Town would not be an attractive place if it consisted solely of high density housing.</p>		
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	<p>The figures quoted are based on old data and should be reviewed to link "current" needs and build to a supply and demand "hand in hand policy with equal industry & employment growth and not a build at will from old data provided in circa 2005.As we are not the only local or national scheme of this type. Bury St Edmunds will build too many houses thus destroying its current & future integrity. Yes build. Not swamp. Phased build should be enforced & not left to the developer to decide when to build avoiding a mass build at the end of 2025 -31</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
	Paul Lamplough				<p>Paragraph 5.10 refers to a "MINIMUM" number of homes on each development. Which is a change / dilutions of the wording from the Core Strategy which refers to "around" (Take that to mean more or less and not now a minimum !).Thus again in favour of the developer(s) with every extra house = extra "Additional" profit at the expensive of housing density & quality of life, not withstanding the additional burden on the fragile infrastructure, jobs, corridor effect on the future of Bury St Edmunds and this is not acceptable. Should be Reviewed Post Haste The proposal map shown is of Poor scale, and in favour of the developer. (N-E BSE)</p>	The reference to minimum numbers in paragraph 5.10 should be removed as suggested. The Policies map (formerly proposal map) has been amended and further detail provided in the various concept statements.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Too many houses for this location. Brownfield sites MUST be looked at and financial help given to developers to check these sites as an encouragement to use them first. Greenfield sites are the easy option at present.	The number of houses for each area was established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. Brownfield sites continue to be favoured for development, but opportunities are limited, particularly in the current economic climate, due to the typically higher costs of development.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Retain the existing housing settlement boundaries for planning permssoin for the north-east area towards Gt Barton, railway line a natural boundary, and the north-west area towards Fornham All Saints. Both areas should remain undeveloped to protect the environment surrounding Bury.	This is not an option, as the areas for strategic growth have already been identified in the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. However, the concept statements indicate how the identity of the surrounding villages will be protected.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	The expansion of housing into the fields around Bury is wrong. Crop land is valuable for long-term production of food, fuel and material. This is more important for our community than is a short-term profit for a few property developers. Small holding (with associated homes) might be suitable, as they continue food production.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town. Smallholdings may be desirable, but to meet the housing requirements of the borough would consume far more countryside.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Any new developments must be only on brown field/existing sites & NOT on edges of villages or open areas/fields etc.	Whereas the delivery of brownfield sites is an important element of the plan, there are insufficient sites to meet the needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	Brownfield sites should be made first priority	Whereas the delivery of brownfield sites is an important element of the plan, there are insufficient sites to meet the needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Brownfield sites should be made first priority	Whereas the delivery of brownfield sites is an important element of the plan, there are insufficient sites to meet the needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	The housing settlement boundary is too extensive and encroaches unacceptably on surrounding villages. It will destroy the present clear division between the town and our rural, greenfield heritage surrounding BSE.	Amendments have been made to the housing settlement boudaries to address this concern, specifically excluding the green buffer/strategic open space areas.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Cllr Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	Fewer houses in fewer locations with greater use of brownfield sites	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. Whereas the delivery of brownfield sites is an important element of the plan, there are insufficient sites to meet the needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR21591E	H I Quayle			no	Housing settlement boundary for north-west Bury St Edmunds to be aligned with new relief road between A1101 and B1106	Agreed.	Amend housing settlement boundary to align with relief road.
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	cut urban sprawl. take out of the plan buildings that will create noise and traffic issues.	The plan proposes sustainable walkable neighbourhoods.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough				THE NUMBER OF HOUSES KEEPS INCREASING IN THE WORDING IE AROUND TO MINIMUM ETC.THIS IS NOT CONSTANT UNLIKE THE ROAD POLICY INFRASTRUCTURE WHICH IS NON-EXISTENT	Paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	The use of brownfield sites for appropriate development should be encouraged to make effective use of land within the town boundary and to avoid areas becoming derelict and unattractive. New development sites should only go ahead when there is a clear need for additional housing and when all the infrastructure and facilities to support that development are in place.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	No convincing case has been made that there is a genuine need for this level of growth. The NE, Moreton Hall and SE areas of the town are to be overdeveloped. These areas will be effectively interlinked but do not have the infrastructure to support them. In particular they will each create more traffic at existing black spots. The proposed link roads will not solve the problems. Additional access to the A14 and town centre should be provided before carrying out any more development. Paragraph 5:10 refers to a minimum number of homes at each location which represents a change of the wording from the Core Strategy which refers to around a stated number of homes and is not acceptable.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. Do not accept the specified areas will be overdeveloped. The development of strategic sites will require infrastructure changes to accommodate the growth. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans will set out what infrastructure is needed before housing development is first brought into occupation. Additional access points to the A14 will not be permitted by the Highways Agency, but improvements to the Rookery Crossroads junction (45) and the provision of the eastern relief Road will provide a realistic alternative. Agree that paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers in respect of Moreton Hall.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	The hospital location at Westley fields was presented as a fait accompli, with the developers riding rough shod over the residents concerns. The traffic surveys by the developer used to justify the traffic flow were based on their consult coming town on one day and making assumptions. Further 'surveys' are apparently based on a census taking between 10am and 4pm - missing the vital rush hours. The overall plan is based on 'old' central planning policy and will not resolve core issue around jobs, parking and traffic flows	The site for the hospital will not be required until the end of the plan period. However, unless such a site is protected from other forms of development in the meantime, such a vital and strategic facility could be lost. Further comprehensive surveys have been undertaken and more will be required as information will need to be reviewed periodically.	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	There is no evidence that we need this number of houses. The traffic infrastructure now can not cope so how will it manage when more traffic is forced into the black spots. The Rookery Crossroads will not safely cope with additional traffic. The run-in lanes are too short. The approach lane from Mount Road is too narrow with blind spots.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. It is not intended that development should take place without addressing issues relating to infrastructure. The plan makes it clear that the Rookery crossroads needs upgrading with longer slip roads and a new relief road connecting it with moreton Hall, avoiding Mount Road altogether.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	The wording of Minimum has changed from previous policy's LDF & Core Strategy etc and the word Minimum means a VERY STRONG POSSIBILITY LEANING to even MORE houses	Paragraph 5.10 should not refer to minimum numbers.	Remove "minimum" from paragraph 5:10.
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes	When planning new estates in particular, please try to avoid making them high density. Too many new estates seem to have houses crammed together and have narrow roads through the estates. Wider roads, perhaps with small trees between the road and pavement give much more sense of space.	Until recently, all development was subject to a density directive, requiring higher densities. This has now been removed and a range of densities is proposed. Further detail can be found in the concept statements for the strategic growth areas.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I would like us to recognise that Bury is a jewel in the crown. It cannot cope with a 31% increase in size/population. Why should it be forced to do so by this ill-thought through plan? Terry Clements said that there is no solution to the gridlocking during peak hours. That's before we have increased in size by 31%. To suggest Fornham All Saints won't be subsumed into Bury in a matter of years is just ill-conceived. The Core Strategy is not law - it cannot be slavishly followed even though it is as plain as the nose on one's face that the plans and the figures do not add up.	There is no reason why Bury St Edmunds should not be able to grow, without damaging its intrinsic character, the key is how this growth is managed. The growth to the north west of Bury St Edmunds will not only protect the identity of Fornham All saints, but includes measures which will positively benefit the village, such as removing traffic cutting through the village to access the A14.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			no	Concrete plans for every aspect of the development not just houses. Protection of existing local communities in the villages surrounding Bury St. Edmunds. People move to this part of the country for a historic market town with plenty of green spaces, relatively low crime and good schools. However considerable new house development on green belt land, is certainly going to have a detrimental effect on the Bury St. Edmunds we know now. The local education and police services will not be able to sustain the current level of service	One of the reasons that growth is required is that people choose to move to this part of the country for a historic market town with plenty of green spaces, relatively low crime and good schools. We cannot prevent that, nor would we wish to, but we must accommodate it and protect that which we cherish. There is no Green Belt in St Edmundsbury.	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	As an iteration of national policy and in keeping with the Core Strategy, it is fine.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (BV1)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy BV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	The boundaries are too close to neighbouring villages and settlements. Settlement protection must be established at the allocation stage to ensure distinctness of village settlements	The Core Strategy sets out that surrounding villages should be protected from being consumed by the strategic areas of growth. It is considered that due to location and strategic buffers that the villages around BSE will be protected as required in the Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR21763E	Jim Thorndyke	St Edmundsbury BC		no	The housing settlement boundary for Bury St Edmunds includes areas of land currently within other parish boundaries and described in the St Eds Local Plan 2016 as countryside where new housing development will not be permitted these include large areas of Great Barton and Rougham. At the same time you propose to remove various settlement boundaries from villages, including Stanton, to stifle development yet many of these areas are more sustainable than the sites around Bury St Edmunds currently are, seems like one rule for BSE and a different rule for the villages. While BSE is allowed to grow the villages are to be moth balled - no wonder people are moving into the towns or away from St Edmundsbury.	It is acknowledged that the Strategic sites as proposed around Bury St Edmunds are within parish boundaries of those villages that surround Bury St Edmunds. The Boundary Commission set ward and parish boundaries and there location is not a material planning consideration. In addition it is also acknowledged that these sites are within Open Countryside as defined in the Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan 2016. The Vision Documents seek to replace the 2016 Local Plan and as such the Local Plan designation would not be a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications. The remaining points are relevant to the Rural Vision 2031 document	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no	There is too much development within the town centre itself. This will only add congestion onto the existing road infrastructure.	The town centre remains vibrant while many others are failing. We seek to maintain it that way. Road congestion is an issues, but it is one which can be managed.	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	I consider that the proposed development is far too much. If it goes ahead, the town will lose all identity and become a mini Milton Keynes and nearby villages will lose their identities. There has been little or no emphasis on the environmental impact of this proposal, in particular issues around water shortages	The amount of development is set out in the adopted Core Strategy and not in the Bury Vision Document. It does not bear comparison with Milton Keynes which post dates 1967 and was designed around the car. Although this is the driest part of the country, water supply is not a significant issue.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15736	Mrs T A Chandler			no	<p>1. The estates are already fully congested with on road parking, and any link with a new estate would make it impossible to manoeuvre and frustrating for all involved.</p> <p>2. We do not need another primary school - we have Howard Primary School which could be renovated to cope with a higher amount of children, which will be needed when they go to the two-tier system. This would therefore be cost effective and not waste public money by knocking down an existing one and rebuilding.</p> <p>3. The Howard Middle School could be converted into a youth centre so that the local children had somewhere to go and something to do.</p>	<p>Most of these issues are identified in the concept statement for the area and will need to be addressed by the masterplan. Any links between the site and the Howard and Mildenhall estates will be for pedestrians and cyclists, not motorists. However, provision for a bus link should be made. The amount of development does require the provision of an additional primary school. It is acknowledged that the future structure of the education system in Bury St Edmunds is yet to be determined and alternative opportunities for primary school provision may arise. However, until such decisions have been made, it is necessary to make provision within the site.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process
					<p>4. We do not have enough green spaces in Bury and I for one walk my dog through the woods which is next to the farmers field which you are talking about, and I know a lot of others do too. It is refreshing to walk off the estate and be in the 'countryside' within a few minutes. If you decide to build here it will make us all feel very claustrophobic and oppressed. Also what effect will it have on the prices of our houses? Will the Council be making any payments for compensation for the effect that this will make to the people that have lived here for years?</p> <p>5. In your plan you have mentioned it being 'safer' - well I don't think it will be. There will be more chance of burglaries and being abused on the streets. More people - more problems.</p>	<p>The allocation includes significant areas of open space, which can range in use from formal recreation grounds to open parkland. These will be accessible to existing residential areas. The conclusion that more people equates to more problems is not accepted.</p>	
	Mrs T A Chandler				<p>6. Closing Tut Hill is NOT an option either. How would you suggest people from the Fornham villages get up to the by-pass? You would force them through the town and cause even more congestion. Not logical! Even a link road would be more upheaval and destruction of the area and wildlife.</p> <p>7. We do not need 900 more houses built. There are houses all over Bury that are empty. Why are these houses not being updated for use?</p> <p>8. Our council taxes are high enough as it is.</p> <p>In conclusion I do not feel that this development should be allowed on this side of the town and feel that a build of this size should be more to the Rougham side of town where there is a lot more space and not immediately between the town and a village.</p>	<p>The closure of Tut Hill will be an option, once the relief road is provided to create an alternative route around the village. It will be for residents of Fornham all Saints to influence to final decision. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15740	M. Butler			no	<p>My main area of concern is the link between Clay Road and the new Estate, as I understand there are three possible ways that this link might take shape:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new road to link Clay Road with the new Estate for use by any vehicle 2. A new road to link Clay Road with the new Estate used as a Bus Route. 3. A Pedestrian path to link Clay Road with the New Estate. <p>Please note my concerns listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Road link would prove to be a rat run for people living else where on the Howard/Mildenhall/Woodfield Park Estates using the road as a short cut through to the A14 etc. <p>I do not believe that Clay Road is wide enough to take such traffic. It is a residential road that is also used to park cars and an increase in traffic along Clay road would cause much more congestion. Resident of Warwick Drive and the Clay Road spur will find it difficult to exit their roads with the increase in traffic.</p>	Most of these issues are identified in the concept statement for the area and will need to be addressed by the masterplan. Any links between the site and the Howard and Mildenhall estates will be for pedestrians and cyclists, not motorists. However, provision for a bus link should be made.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15740	M. Butler			no	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How will the Link Road be restricted to Buses only??? <p>If it is just a Traffic sign people will ignore it and take a short cut.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. My preferred Outcome!!! 		
BVR15741	Valerie Butler			no	<p>My main area of concern is the link between Clay Road and the new Estate, as I understand there are three possible ways that this link might take shape:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new road to link Clay Road with the new Estate for use by any vehicle 2. A new road to link Clay Road with the new Estate used as a Bus Route. 3. A Pedestrian path to link Clay Road with the New Estate. 	Most of these issues are identified in the concept statement for the area and will need to be addressed by the masterplan. Any links between the site and the Howard and Mildenhall estates will be for pedestrians and cyclists, not motorists. However, provision for a bus link should be made.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Valerie Butler				<p>Please note my concerns listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Road link would prove to be a rat run for people living else where on the Howard/Mildenhall/Woodfield Park Estates using the road as a short cut through to the A14 etc. <p>I do not believe that Clay Road is wide enough to take such traffic. It is a residential road that is also used to park cars and an increase in traffic along Clay road would cause much more congestion. Resident of Warwick Drive and the Clay road spur will find it difficult to exit their roads with the increase in traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How will the Link Road be restricted to Buses only??? <p>If it is just a Traffic sign people will ignore it and take a short cut.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. My preferred Outcome!!! 		
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15772	Richard Dubery			no	<p>It will be interesting to see what "consultation" is carried out - Our Council usually use these periods of time to simply tell us what they are going to do regardless of what we think, and requests from Terence O'Rourke Limited, the Consultants being used for the plans, for updates on the progress of the plans have met with no reply.</p> <p>The promises of tree belts, avenue planting, recreation grounds, pedestrian, cycle and bus links to Howard & Mildenhall Estates all seem a bit ambitious and Utopian to me. The Developers will be interested in building their houses as quickly as possible, selling them and running away with the cash. The "Add Ons" will not happen and are likely to be left to the Council to do. This attitude is why there is no proper walkway between the Town Centre and The Arc, as promised; why residents in new parts of Moreton Hall have lived in houses for months without street lights and footpaths.</p>	This response is a direct result of the consultation which has been carried out so far and the details which have informed the concept statement have resulted from that consultation. It will continue through the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Richard Dubery				<p>Although these new proposals at the Moreton Hall side of Town allow for a new A14 link road, to date several thousand houses have been built there and no new roads/access built, so why will another relatively low number of 900 houses demand any new roads in the North-West area ? And when did we last have a reliable bus service in this Town ? First Group is already leaving because they cannot make it pay so not a good omen. Cycle "links" are fine, but there are no cycle paths along many of the main routes, so cyclists have to brave the normal traffic to get anywhere they need to go.</p>		
	Richard Dubery				<p>What are the proposed routes of these roads and walkways ? If they are planning on linking them to existing roads/paths, those have been established for years and can barely cope with the use they already get. The roads and paths in and around Howard & Mildenhall estates are already in a very poor state of repair and difficult and dangerous to negotiate due to the levels of inconsiderately and illegally parked cars. I had assurances from Andrew Tipple at Suffolk County Council that repairs were going to be carried out last Summer to some of the roads but the issues remain unresolved and I am afraid we have to judge the projected success of their plans against past performance which does not fill me with confidence.</p>		
	Richard Dubery				<p>The existing "major" roads will not cope with the occupants of another 900 houses fighting to get to the A14 or in to the Town Centre/local schools. The residents will have two options (unless they create rat runs through Fornham or Risby) - go up towards Newmarket Road, already choc-solid with traffic including the buses and cars going to the College and King Edward school, as well as turning down Western Way to the schools and businesses along there and Beetons Way; or head towards Mildenhall Road and Fornham Road, which was always busy and is getting worse. Traffic already queues back to the Tollgate pub, it will now back up to the Tollgate Lane traffic light junction and will therefore have knock on effects to Tollgate Lane/Beetons Way and eventually merge with the queues in Western Way which in turn will merge with Newmarket Road, as detailed above - Gridlock !</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
					<p>The Council should FIRST sort out the roads and for Fornham Road: put some proper drainage in (it floods too easily, as does Mildenhall Road so dangerous and appalling for pedestrians and cyclists); get Tesco to enforce their own rules for the use of their rear car park (staff & visitors ONLY, not customer use); undo the messed up junction at the foot of Station Hill and allow cars travelling along Out Northgate to continue and not be hindered by those turning up Station Hill; stop emptying bins between 8.00 and 8.30am, especially as they have now changed the collection day to Wednesday, Market day !</p> <p>It will be interesting to see what develops.</p>		
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	Archaeological evaluation has been carried out to inform the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15788	Paul R. Bridges			no	<p>Looking at the site plan and the outline of the development site it appears that the proposed development could eventually link Bury St Edmunds to Fornham All Saints (FAS). It is important to recognize that FAS is a separate village and it is important that the identity of the village remains just that.</p> <p>The demarcation lines between the town of BSE and the village of FAS should be unequivocal.</p> <p>The proposed development has an indicative capacity of 900 dwellings. it therefore makes this development larger in capacity than the village of FAS and will easily outnumber the number of residents in the village giving the impression that it could swamp the village in size and numbers.</p> <p>The number of extra vehicles alone is likely to create a number of problems to the area in general and more particularly to the town of BSE. Parking is already becoming a major problem, traffic congestion certainly is.</p>	<p>This separation is important to protect the identity of Fornham All Saints and the housing settlement boundary has been redrawn to follow the line of the proposed relief road to reinforce this. The capacity of the site has been examined previously prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2010.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Paul R. Bridges				<p>It is no good suggesting that the new development will be designed to limit car ownership by encouraging people to use public transport, walk or cycle. Although the idea is good, in practice it has never worked.</p> <p>There are not the available employment opportunities in and around the area, so many people will need their own vehicles to travel to jobs etc outside of town.</p> <p>There will be more pressure on the Health Service, Schools, Social Services, Social Care and a requirement to provide additional Child Care places.</p> <p>Regarding the development itself. Although the outline for the development has been shown, very little has appeared which actually shows the design or layout of housing and amenities, which is crucial for any firm judgment to be made.</p> <p>It is important that a buffer zone is introduced to separate the new development from FAS, to ensure no loss of identity to FAS. Ideally this could be done with the introduction of sympathetic trees and hedging.</p>	<p>Making provision for walking and cycling provides people with the ability to use alternative forms of transport. It cannot compel people to use them.</p> <p>There are significant existing employment opportunities in the vicinity, but additional provision is possible within the site. Additional resources will be required to meet the demand created. This is included in the infrastructure delivery plan. Detail of the shape of development including the buffer zone is included in the concept statement and will be developed further through the masterplan.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul R. Bridges				<p>It is also important to introduce tree and hedge planting and green areas within the development itself and as much as possible around it.</p> <p>It would make sense surely, for any industrial units/buildings to be situated close to the existing buildings just off the Mildenhall Road on the outskirts of the town.</p> <p>As there is already a problem on Tut Hill with excess water off the fields at the top end of FAS on Tut Hill, this needs to be addressed when the development starts, to ensure sufficient drainage is in place to accommodate removal of water drainage with the reduction of natural water drainage the existing land soaks up.</p> <p>One of the most important aspects to the new development would be accessing it by vehicles whilst the development is under way, and more importantly when it is complete.</p>	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Paul R. Bridges				<p>Tut Hill is quite unable and inappropriate for the amount of traffic currently using it, without adding to the problem with the introduction of even more vehicles.</p> <p>The most sensible solution surely would be to close Tut Hill to through traffic, making it a resident only zone, and to make sure that at the absolute earliest convenient time, the additional road is in place to divert traffic from a point along the B1106 that skirts Tut Hill and connects to the Mildenhall Road closer to BSE.</p>	The options for Tut Hill will be considered through the masterplan process. It will be for residents of Fornham all Saints to influence to final decision.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't think you should permit an extension of the suburbs around the town - and if your targets for housing development were lower, you would not have to allocate these outlying sites for development.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	<p>Policy BV1 is in direct conflict with Policy 4b of the Development Management document that was consulted upon earlier in 2012. That policy states that new development will only be permitted where 'it will not result in the irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)'. It is certain that the greenfield land in the SE Bury region is Grade 3a, and the same is probably true for the other greenfield sites proposed. We are advised that SEBC will circumvent this 'inconvenient truth' by simultaneous adoption of the Development Management and Vision 2031 documents, but it is exactly this sort of administrative manoeuvre that undermines public confidence in and respect for the planning process.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed massive expansion onto greenfield sites is directly contrary to views raised in the Core Strategy consultation about coalescence, overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion.</p>	It is accepted that the strategic growth areas will use higher grade agricultural land. There is no lower grade land around Bury St Edmunds. However, this does not conflict with the emerging Development Management Document as the policy referred to relates to countryside outside the housing settlement boundary. The land identified for strategic growth in the Core Strategy and located within the housing settlement boundary by this policy will not be classified as countryside.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15878	Yvonne Galloway			no	The boundary of this development includes established woodland along the back of the Howard and Mildenhall estates, but the preferred option for the site does not show that this long stretch of woodland would remain as it is. It would be absolutely unacceptable if these woodlands were removed/reduced in any way.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Map should show proposed relief road and green/open space.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	See answer to question 4. SEBC needs to listen to local residents affected and base housing numbers of their views, not on a predetermined figures for housing. Need to consider landscape, heritage and archaeological issues	The numbers have already been established by the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2010. The other details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	The development of this area, whilst as feasible as any, would effectively join Bury to Fornham, blending the two together which I was lead to believe was in contravention of the Policy in the first Place. Good development option but care required to keep the village identity.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no opinion	We do not live here, but it looks like infill.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	No segregation between existing buildings and the proposed development.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	No segregation between Bury St Edmunds and new development.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The Parish Council have reservations about agreeing to this with the boundary extremely close to the settlement village. The buffer to maintain the identity of the village must be started at the allocation stage to afford protection from any part of the development. Time scales must be stipulated within the developers Masterplan.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The new boundary will join the Howard estate to Fornham All Saints and decimate open views.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You are not keeping 'green' land between development/town and villages.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes	We agree with the boundary as defined	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I do not agree with the expansion as shown. A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	The option of a new settlement as an alternative, was considered early in the preparation of the Core Strategy and dismissed.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not object to the development boundary of this site, but we would advise that this option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	Archaeological evaluation has been carried out to inform the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			If a demonstrable need can be proven for expansion, the Society believes this must be for mixed uses including employment. The need to maintain an effective substantial landscape buffer between the allocation and the settlement of Fornham All Saints is emphasised to maintain the independence and identity of the existing community.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27,28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, would remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	Provided there is a "buffer zone" between the development and Fornham village.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Retain boundary as existing, area to remain agricultural.	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This is valuable crop land, which we need for food, fuel and material. The boundary of Bury should not encroach onto the boundaries of nearby villages, such as Fornham All Saints.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no	The problem is that whilst one does not want to be accused of NIMBYism there is no viable space between the current boundary of BSE (the Mercedes Benz dealership) and FAS to develop without compromising FAS's individuality as a village. It would simply become part of BSE and lose its identity. The parish council put forward a reasonable compromise but that has been ignored in its material terms. This site should not be used at all I am afraid. It is farmland now and that is how it should remain. If more housing is required in West Suffolk the Council needs to be more flexible with change of use of sites and buildings no longer needed by agriculture and related food processing industries; there are plenty about. This would produce both more concentrated towns and more dispersed rural development. In effect, a green belt should be set up around BSE and similar towns.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone. The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Must not enlarge on existing development boundaries i.e. NO new developments on fields/green areas	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R Taylor			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	Less valuable farmland should be used for development.	There is no less valuable farmland around Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Less valuable farmland should be used for development.	There is no less valuable farmland around Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21591E	H I Quayle			no	The Proposals Map on page 25 of "Bury Vision 2031" shows the north-west boundary abutting the B1106, the Fish Farm industrial estate, and the A1101. The housing settlement boundary should follow the line of the new relief road, as shown on page 95	This separation is important to protect the identity of Fornham All Saints and the housing settlement boundary has been redrawn to follow the line of the proposed relief road to reinforce this.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	urban sprawl unknown quality of buildings	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ADDRESS AND STARTED PRIOR TO ANY DEVELOPMENT BUILDING EG MORTON HALL / WIMPY.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	To large an expansion for the site with Fornham All Saints being absorbed into town curtilage	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Fornham All Saints is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Roads into Bury St Edmunds have no improvements e.g. Mildenhall Road & Thetford Road/ Fornham Road	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	It ain't broke. Don't fix it. Fornham has existed for hundreds of years. You are going to destroy its identity.	Town and village boundaries constantly change over time. This development is required to meet the needs of a growing population.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptekeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			no	The hamlet of Cattishall is completely enveloped by both BV2 and BV3. It is not part of Great Barton it is separate with its own community albeit small. The boundaries should protect local residents and communities not scythe through them and destroy what is already been made. If the development damages what makes the area attractive to buyers, you defeat the point of building as the attraction is no longer there to attract buyers. The A143 will not be able to support all the new traffic trying to get into bury and towards Cambridge on the A14. It is already very busy with the sugar beet lorries. The entire development is on arable land I fear that Great Barton will just be seen as suburb of Bury St. Edmunds which it is not. Bury St. Edmunds will also lose its identity will no longer be a town but a mesh of separate villages with the remnants of a market town and medieval monastery site at its centre. The development is on a burial site which has been completely overlooked	Policy BV2 relates to development at north west Bury St Edmunds. That development closest to Cattishall is identified in Policies BV3 and BV5.	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the boundary for the north-west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21763E	Jim Thorndyke	St Edmundsbury BC					
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no	I am concerned about the scale of the continued Moreton Hall development. The houses seem to get smaller with each phase and closer together - any 'green' areas within the developments are literally just small patches of play areas for very small children only -" no provision for the older child/teenage child which can only cause difficulties with neighbours - these are supposedly houses for the family but know space or provision for children of all ages is not conclusive to a peaceful life. With The Flying Fortress being swallowed whole, Mount Road will soon merge with Thurston	Until recently, all development was subject to a density directive, requiring higher densities. This has now been removed and a range of densities is proposed. Further detail can be found in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15790	Mrs P M Lamb	Rougham Parish Council		no	<p>As previously advised, since most of the land to be developed for the Moreton Hall and Business Park extensions fall within this Parish, there needs to be ongoing consultation with this Council during all stages of the developments.</p> <p>Members are unanimous in their opposition to any attempted transfer of these developments into Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>Since the Rushbrooke Lane development will impact on this Parish, we again expect to be fully consulted at every stage.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that, since both the above proposals will impact on a number of rural parishes, they should also be incorporated within the Rural Vision 2031 documentation and processes.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to the whole of St Edmundsbury, and beyond, that Rougham Airfield continues to be used as a recreational area, which includes the use of aircraft and air displays. Therefore any development of the area next to the airfield has to take into consideration the flight-paths currently operated.</p>	<p>Consultation will be ongoing. Although within the parish of Rougham, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds and would only serve to cause confusion if repeated in the rural Vision 2031 document. The uses existing at Rougham airfield are acknowledged and have been taken fully into account.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	The area for the school should be immediately to the south of the football facility and should use land currently designated for industrial development. The spread of land needed for housing can then be reduced	The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Policy BV1 is in direct conflict with Policy 4b of the Development Management document that was consulted upon earlier in 2012. That policy states that new development will only be permitted where 'it will not result in the irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)'. It is certain that the greenfield land in the SE Bury region is Grade 3a, and the same is probably true for the other greenfield sites proposed. We are advised that SEBC will circumvent this 'inconvenient truth' by simultaneous adoption of the Development Management and Vision 2031 documents, but it is exactly this sort of administrative manoeuvre that undermines public confidence in and respect for the planning process. Furthermore, the proposed massive expansion onto greenfield sites is directly contrary to views raised in the Core Strategy consultation about coalescence, overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion.	It is accepted that the strategic growth areas will use higher grade agricultural land. There is no lower grade land around Bury St Edmunds. However, this does not conflict with the emerging Development Management Document as the policy referred to relates to countryside outside the housing settlement boundary. The land identified for strategic growth in the Core Strategy and located within the housing settlement boundary by this policy will not be classified as countryside.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	The area for the school should be immediately to the south of the football facility and not under the flight path. Land currently designated for industrial development should be used and the spread of land needed for housing can then be reduced. The location of this development at some distance from the town centre is in direct contradiction to the principles regarding a modal shift away from car usage. In particular the emphasis on affordable homes will require more facilities and a greater contribution in terms of infrastructure support than required for areas closer to the town. However, if the Council is prepared to provide the necessary support and infrastructure we would support the provision of affordable housing as a part of any further development on the estate.	The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. The area is no further from the town centre than other outlying areas of the town. However, it does have the advantage of existing infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians to access the town centre, unlike other areas. Additional facilities such as a secondary school will assist in removing the need to travel elsewhere.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15811	Malcolm Honour	MgMs Ltd	The Churchmanor Estate Co Plc and Rougham Estate	no	<p>I am instructed by The Churchmanor Estates Co Plc and the Rougham Estate to respond to the consultation. As the Council will be aware, my clients are preparing proposals for the Suffolk Park extension including the Eastern Relief Road. The southern boundary of the Moreton Hall site identified in the document adjoins that proposed road and the boundaries of the Moreton Hall development area will, in that respect, be related to the alignment of the Relief Road.</p> <p>The appendices to the Vision 31 document include options that were considered for the position of the southern boundary but Churchmanor and the Rougham Estate support the selected boundary. It appropriately reflects the road alignment that is being brought forward and is consistent with the Masterplan that has been submitted to, and approved by, the Council. An element of flexibility is required to accommodate the technical details of the road but this is unlikely to materially affect the position of the southern boundary of the Moreton Hall site and, accordingly, it should be included in the document as drafted.</p>	Support for the selected boundary is appreciated.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	<p>The area for the school should be immediately to the south of the football facility and not under the flight path. Land currently designated for industrial development should be used and the spread of land needed for housing can then be reduced.</p> <p>The location of this development at some distance from the town centre is in direct contradiction to the principles regarding a modal shift away from car usage. In particular the emphasis on affordable homes will require more facilities and a greater contribution in terms of infrastructure support than required for areas closer to the town. However, if the Council is prepared to provide the necessary support and infrastructure we would support the provision of affordable housing as a part of any further development on the estate.</p>	The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. The area is no further from the town centre than other outlying areas of the town. However, it does have the advantage of existing infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians to access the town centre, unlike other areas. Additional facilities such as a secondary school will assist in removing the need to travel elsewhere.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	<p>We do not agree with the boundaries proposed for the development of Moreton Hall.</p> <p>Our objection relates to the land north of Mount Road where the prospective 'geometric' boundary described on the draft preferred proposals map does not reflect any physical boundaries on the land or the factor of landownership.</p> <p>We do not object to the definition of the employment allocation and the eastern boundaries of the prospective community football area, secondary school and residential development area south of Mount Road as these are defined by the boundary of Rougham Airfield.</p>	The concept statement would create the eastward boundary. Any extension eastward would create a precedent for extending further into countryside.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Rougham Airfield is proposed to be subject to Policy BV22 to which we have no objection. As a result, the boundary of development with Rougham Airfield established for the Moreton Hall urban extension is likely to endure over an extended time period, potentially longer than the life of this Plan. It will therefore be important that this boundary is properly designed and the priority here should be a well landscaped urban edge. Particularly in the area south of Mount Road this urban edge will be visible and ultimately familiar to all who use Rougham Airfield for the purposes for which its retention is described in the Plan.</p>	This is acknowledged and will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>There is already an extensive stand of trees that occupies and defines a part of this boundary and it can be expected that these will be retained and reinforced, creating an enhanced robust green edge to the site and wider urban area. It is considered that the enhancement of the landscaped nature of the eastern boundary will reinforce the degree of separation between the site and the wider landscape setting to the east, whilst also creating a robust defensible edge to the built up area (Landscape and Visual Assessment - Aspect Landscape Planning for Taylor Wimpey paragraph 5.9). Such proposals will be subject to detailed landscape design which is in hand and which Taylor Wimpey will expect to discuss with the Council in due course.</p>	This will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		Since 2011 and the Government's withdrawal of minimum density requirements for residential development, the overall density of residential proposals has begun to fall. This is encouraged by advice on good design which is appropriate to its location and endorsed by the NPPF (paragraph 47). Core Strategy Policy CS3 emphasises consideration of density as one of the major components of good design - as well as protection of the landscape and historic views and an understanding of the local context. Neither the Core Strategy or Vision 2031 attempts to set a local approach to determining appropriate densities; indeed Vision 2031 is silent on this issue although it is noted that some advice is given in respect of other strategic areas such as the allocation west of the town.	This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		The site context is important as it is considered that a graduation in densities with a progressive reduction to the eastern boundary of the town and a substantial landscaped urban edge will be a key factor in establishing the character of the development. Core Strategy Policy CS11 refers to the delivery of around 500 homes neither prescribing that as the minimum or as a limit. Taylor Wimpey wish to work with St Edmundsbury Council to agree a Master Plan that will deliver at least 500 dwellings at Moreton Hall, the objective being to deliver development that addresses the requirements of NPPF paragraph 58.	This is acknowledged and will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		The delivery of at least 500 dwellings is important for a number of reasons. Firstly it will ensure the efficient use of the land, optimising the potential of the site (NPPF paragraph 58) and thereby helping it to deliver and sustain the facilities that national policy, the Core Strategy (paragraph 5.12 and Policy CS11) and Vision 2031 Appendix 6 aspire to achieve as part of a mixed use urban extension. It is also important to ensure that sufficient housing is delivered where, even following the revocation of the East of England Plan, the adopted Core Strategy Policy CS1 seeks the delivery of at least 15,400 new homes (net) between 2001 and 2031. The NPPF makes clear that maintaining a five year supply of land is essential and therefore it is considered that ensuring that the most efficient use of sites that are allocated and deliverable will be important to the overall longer term achievement of the Borough Council's planning strategy.	The Core Strategy identifies the delivery of 'around 500 homes'. How this can be best achieved will need to be developed in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		It is noted however that Core Strategy Policy CS11 states that the additional housing will not be permitted until the completion of the Eastern Relief Road to junction 45 of the A14 (Rookery Crossroads). This is reflected in Vision 2031 paragraph 16.12. The justification for this obligation has not yet been fully established but is the subject of work being carried out jointly by Taylor Wimpey with other developers (reflecting the comment at Vision 2031 paragraph 7.19). It is regrettable that this work is incomplete at this stage but Taylor Wimpey and their partners are committed to completing this assessment at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore reserve the right to comment further upon paragraph 16.12 either in the context of this publication or in relation to the Submission Draft.	The delivery of the Eastern Relief Road is a prerequisite as stated in the Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy. It is not for the Vision 2031 document to re-examine that requirement.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Moreover, the cost of implementing the Relief Road is also the subject of on-going design work and has therefore not yet been fully assessed. It can however be expected to be substantial. There will also be other prerequisite infrastructure requirements which will also need to be prefunded.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey control the majority of land comprising the proposed extension to the Suffolk Business Park - Core Strategy Policy CS9 and Vision 2031 Policy BV13. The balance is understood to be controlled by Churchmanor Estates Co plc. Vision 2031 recognises at paragraph 6.9 that this allocation is of a strategic scale and that its delivery may well extend beyond the plan period - in other words whilst paragraph 6.9 also reflects the requirement in policy that the Relief Road will have to be provided as part of the development, it is clear that any return on the capital cost of the infrastructure will not be capable of being amortized by the employment land within a reasonable period.</p>		
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>It is also noted that paragraph 6.10 refers to the possibility of workable sand and gravel reserves that will need to be fully investigated prior to planning permission for the development of the site, with a potential need for prior extraction.</p> <p>It is noted that delivery of the Eastern Relief Road is solely related to the implementation of the Moreton Hall urban extension and that, whilst there is a joint approach to traffic assessment, there is no obligation on other developers to contribute to its delivery given that there are other strategic highway improvements which they will be required to affect. In practice, the cost of constructing the Eastern Relief Road will fall very substantially upon the residential elements of Moreton Hall as it is these components which are most likely to come forward first and consequently provide the revenue stream to offset the initial capital costs of the infrastructure.</p>	The infrastructure requirements for different parts of the town vary and a holistic view is required to address them. Whereas the delivery of the Eastern relief Road is fundamental to the delivery of homes at Moreton Hall, there is no requirement to delay development until other infrastructure projects affecting other strategic sites are completed.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Indeed, without the construction of the housing, which will also be expected to deliver other infrastructure needed to support the employment development, the Business Park extension is even less likely to be considered as genuinely available.</p> <p>Development viability is a key issue, particularly outside the four principal regional centres of East Anglia. Vision 2031 places considerable emphasis on the importance of extending Suffolk Business Park as a long term land resource with potential to secure high quality development likely to attract the type of high technology user upon which the Borough lays considerable emphasis (paragraph 6.11) as well as enabling the town to respond to changes in employment demand by allowing opportunity and flexibility for older, inappropriately located or poor quality employment sites within the town to be regenerated or re-used for other purposes (paragraph 6.10). Securing the genuine availability and delivery of the Suffolk Business Park Extension should therefore be of the very highest priority.</p>		
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>If, as can be established, the rate of delivery on this long term project is unlikely to recoup the initial capital cost of delivering the Relief Road, to be completed before any return can be secured on the development of the land, it will be necessary to ensure that the residential component is sufficient to carry the cost burden whilst also being viable to deliver.</p> <p>Having regard to the expected obligations on residential development and the desirable provision of community infrastructure, sustainable construction and environmental quality, it is essential that the deliverable area of residential development is maximised. Without sufficient projected return the wider interests of new home provision and, more importantly employment potential, will not be capable of realisation within the timescale that would secure the objectives intended by the Core Strategy.</p>	Development viability will need to be addressed at the appropriate time, taking full account of the requirements of the concept statement and masterplan, and economic circumstances pertaining at the time.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Alternatively, the ability to deliver key community objectives such as affordable homes and other desirable elements of community infrastructure may need to be reviewed to ensure that the overall cost of developing the Moreton Hall strategic urban extension is capable of being funded.</p> <p>Having regard to the desirability of establishing densities that are appropriate to the long term edge of Bury St Edmunds, to the provision of a suitable landscape transition to Rougham Airfield and to the open countryside, to the need to ensure that sufficient housing is available and to the viability of development in relation to significant up front infrastructure costs as well as the cost of providing community infrastructure including affordable housing, it is desirable, and necessary, to ensure that land for at least 500 dwellings is identified and that there is no material harm that arises if this figure is exceeded.</p>		
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>As noted above, the boundaries of the residential area south of Mount Road are determined by the Rougham Airfield and its associated flight path safeguarding zone, by the desirable allocation of land as an extension of the strategic open space west of Lady Miriam Way and by the need to provide a local centre taking into account the existing public house and its grounds. Consequently the only area allowing flexibility in relation to boundaries is that area to the north of Mount Road.</p> <p>Our proposal is that the boundary of development be extended by approximately 130m as compared to the indicative line described in the Council's current Preferred Option. This reflects a number of considerations.</p>	This matter is addressed above.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Firstly, as previously noted, there is no field boundary in the area north of Mount Road which reflects the boundary to the Airfield Policy area to the south. The existing field boundary lies some 400m to the east. We do not however propose that this existing field boundary be used to define the limit of development because this would significantly extend the built up edge of the town into the countryside and leave development distant and relatively poorly related to the preferred location of the Local Centre.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the boundary should extend to a point approximately 130m to the east, which reflects the extent of the area under option to Taylor Wimpey for the delivery of housing development. This extension would add about 2.2 ha to the overall residential area (12%). It would allow an appropriate graduation of densities at the outer edge of the town with suitable landscape treatment along the eastern edge and along Mount Road which so as to provide a transitional area between the open countryside and the built up area.</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>It will also allow sufficient land to be set aside for landscaping and the amelioration of noise impacts alongside the railway comparable or better than that provided in respect of the existing areas abutting the line.</p> <p>None of the development would be further than about 650m from the local centre (linear) which is comparable or better than may existing parts of Moreton Hall to existing shops and community facilities - which are up to 850m (linear).</p> <p>Overall it will allow for approximately 20.4 ha of gross developable area which it is considered will allow for the development of about 560 dwellings at an average of 30 dwellings per hectare - 18.6 net developable hectares after structural landscaping, principal highway and footpath/cycleway corridor and non strategic open space. It is considered that this level of development represents the best opportunity to secure funding necessary to enable delivery of the Relief Road whilst also allowing other planning objectives to be delivered.</p>		
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Realistically it is believed that the overall density may be lower arising from the desirability of reducing densities around the fringes of the scheme without increasing them significantly higher than the overall for Moreton Hall as a whole in the core areas. Having regard to this densities might need to rise significantly above 30 dwellings per hectare overall in order to secure 500 homes on the basis of the land area proposed in the Vision 2031 Preferred Option given that the quantum of structural uses that should be excluded from the measurement will be the same for both the Preferred Option and the alternative proposed here.</p>		
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Taylor Wimpey therefore consider that there are sound reasons for the amendment of the Preferred Option boundary in order to secure the wider objectives of delivering the Moreton Hall urban extension in conjunction with the infrastructure pre-requisites identified by the Core Strategy and to do so in a way that is appropriate to the site and its location.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	* This is in the parish/over into the boundary of Great Barton and is positively promoting continued urban sprawl. * AGAINST ALL POLICIES * The building line (Cattishall) has been broken north of the railway (All within vision from Mount Road) * The Homes have not been respected within this and been singular isolated this again is promoting urban sprawl.	Although situated within parishes, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds. Concerns about design and urban sprawl are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Map should show green/open space.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	See answers to question 3, 4, and 5 above. SEBC needs to listen to local residents affected and base housing numbers of their views, not on a predetermined figure. Need to consider landscape, heritage and traffic issues.	The numbers have already been established by the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2010. The other details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Proposed school to south of football ground not north, as football ground seems unable or unwilling to be moved south into industrial area. What happened to the Lady Miriam boundary?	The relocation of the school as suggested would serve no benefit. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Situation of school should be on A14 side of football ground. Lady Miriam Way should be boundary of Moreton Hall.	The relocation of the school as suggested would serve no benefit.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no	Moreton Hall already has too many houses. I do not want to see any more houses near Great Barton.	There is no definition of 'too many'. This is a subjective judgement.	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	The extreme eastern boundary provides an odd shape to the edge of town and is not consistent with the proposed boundary to the north of the railway line. Development of this site interferes with the existing Cattishall hamlet in that two properties will look completely out of character when surrounded in any new development. Development in this area should be stopped, the existing Moreton Hall already has a workable boundary for the edge of town. Any proposal for community facilities around the Flying Fortress public house puts these at the most eastern of the development and therefore future development further to the east is likely. Any development should be kept clear of the end of the runway.	The development to the north of mount Road will relate to that proposed on the south side of mount Road, rather than the existing hamlet of Cattishall. However, screening and planting will be required to reinforce this. This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	The extreme eastern boundary provides an odd shape to the edge of town and is not consistent with the proposed boundary to the north of the railway line. Development of this site interferes with the existing Cattishall hamlet in that two properties will look completely out of character when surrounded in any new development. Development in this area should be stopped, the existing Moreton Hall already has a workable boundary for the edge of town. Any proposal for community facilities around the Flying Fortress public house puts these at the most eastern of the development and therefore future development further to the east is likely. Any development should be kept clear of the end of the runway.	The development to the north of mount Road will relate to that proposed on the south side of mount Road, rather than the existing hamlet of Cattishall. However, screening and planting will be required to reinforce this. This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	No development in this area. The Eastern side of town has been overdeveloped for years and cannot cope. It has no identity and is poorly designed. Houses on top of each other, no parking at residential properties, etc. A 5 bed family home means that it is more than likely that there will be 3-4 cars at this property as the family grows. Provision should be made for this. The football facility should stay where it is. Residents do not want the traffic, noise and light pollution that it will bring with it. Instead the Council choose to move traffic into an already congested zone. Ridiculous move.	Whereas the eastern side of town has seen much development in recent years, it has not been overdeveloped. The proportion of housing now proposed for this area is only a part of the overall provision across the town. The principle of development in this area has already been confirmed by the Core Strategy. Relocation of the football club already benefits from planning permission.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Unnecessary and far too big.	The need has already been established and the scale is appropriate.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	Would like to see development stopped and the boundary to remain where it is now. If development continues there will be little countryside left between the town and Thurston.	The principle of development in this area has already been confirmed by the Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	This development has been going for 30 years and should be stopped now.	The need for development in this area has already been established in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The opportunity exists to establish Moreton Hall as a distinct model for sustainability if the employment opportunities, infrastructure and services for that community is in balance with their current housing numbers firstly and then with this proposal under this consultation. However, there needs to be regard for the settlements which lie in the parish of Great Barton.	The proposal should bring further facilities such as a secondary school to Moreton Hall. These facilities should be accessible from those parts of the strategic development sites lying within Great Barton Parish.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Moreton Hall has developed continuously since the 1970s. It has taken more housing than intended because cramming was endorsed to free up more space within the original HSB.</p> <p>Despite the development reaching a natural and planned boundary, defined by Lady Miriam Way, the council decided to continue with further irresponsible expansion that will destroy open views, will create urban sprawl and a size of population that should not be accommodated on an edge of town site.</p> <p>The hamlet of Cattishall will lose its identity. Moreton Hall will lose its identity and the infrastructure problems, already acknowledged by experts, will just get worse.</p> <p>The so-called Relief Road was to be built to service Suffolk Business Park and had no relationship with further housing development. To include the relief road in Policy CS11 as an infrastructure improvement associated with housing is a departure from planner briefings.</p>	It is acknowledged that Moreton Hall has accommodated the bulk of new housing and employment provision since the 1970s. However, the area now allocated only forms a part of the development proposed, with other sites spread across the town. Considerable work has been undertaken with residents of Cattishall to protect their identity, primarily in respect of the strategic growth area to the north of the railway line.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Trevor Beckwith				<p>The statement that the 500 additional houses are to 'complete' the Moreton Hall urban extension is untrue. The original Moreton Hall development ends at Lady Miriam Way and to suggest otherwise is wrong.</p> <p>The HSB should remain as it is with any development contained within it.</p>	The Vision 2031 does not state that development will complete Moreton Hall, although there are no plans at present to extend it any further.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You are not keeping 'green' land between development/town and villages.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Proposed secondary school should not be built under flight path. Infrastructure cannot cope with existing traffic and proposed relief/link road will be of no help - wrong place, wrong route. Moreton Hall is already over developed. LDF says Policy 4d no significant adverse impact on local road network.	The proposed secondary school will not be built within the aircraft safeguarding zone. Not sure how the relief road is in the wrong place, as it provides a direct link from Moreton Hall and Suffolk Business Park with the A14.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I do not agree with the expansion plans as shown. The new relief road from the A14 will cause a 'rat run' of HGVs shortcutting to the Thetford/A11 routes. This would be through the middle of a wholly residential area including only added schools (and therefore a greater traffic of childcare/cycles etc). Moreton Hall has had excessive expansion already and no further outward expansion would be advantageous.	The relief road is intended to provide direct access between Moreton Hall and Suffolk Business Park and the A14. The danger of creating a 'rat run' to the A134 needs to be examined and addressed.	Ensure traffic analysis addresses potential rat running between Junction 45 of the A14 and the A134 north of Bury St Edmunds.
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not object to the development boundary of this site, but we would advise that this option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that significant improvements to transport links are essential to facilitate further development in this location.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27,28, and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, would remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16022	Keith Allchin	The Flying Fortress			My first major concern is that houses are built very close to the pub restaurant and function rooms and as we have a late night license there would be problems with neighbours complaining about the noise and people leaving late at night. Although at the moment we very rarely have late music nights because we are so isolated there has never been any problems with the above but it is well known that when people move near to an entertainment venue they suddenly realise that noise is a problem.	These details will be developed in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Keith Allchin	The Flying Fortress			<p>Secondly I am worried that if the car parking situation is not taken into consideration there will be many problems and conflicts regarding parking on the roads and in private car spaces. On a Sunday lunchtime for example we regularly have 200 to 300 people dining and 90% of those if not all will come by car. At the moment there is plenty of room around the site, on the grass fields beside the pub and down the drive to cater for our needs but should any of this land be taken for other use then problems are bound to occur. It would be so much better to foresee these problems before the event than to have to act when it is too late.</p> <p>At the Flying Fortress much of our water comes from our own well supply and we are also on septic tank drainage with finger drains going out into the fields or down the drives. We would be concerned if houses or other properties were built too close to us so that the purity of the water might be contaminated.</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Keith Allchin	The Flying Fortress			<p>We also have gas and mains water coming up the drive from the main road and would want assurances that these would not be damaged.</p> <p>Mr Osbourne intimated that there might be a road looping round behind us some 40 yards up from the first junction on Lady Miriam Way going out onto Mount Road near the Cattishall turning. If this was the case we would ask that no houses be built inside that loop in close vicinity to the Flying Fortress possibly from this loop or from Lady Miriam Way itself. We would not object in this case if the present drive up to the Flying Fortress be discontinued. He also suggested that there were plans to make the area around the Flying Fortress a village green type environment and we would like to have much more information about this if that were the case. At first sights this looks an excellent idea but we would very much like to know all the implications of such a scheme.</p>		
	Keith Allchin	The Flying Fortress			<p>The biggest problem we have faced up to date is not knowing what the future holds for us. We have owned and run the Flying Fortress now for over 24 years and would like to think that it would survive for many more years to come. Our greatest fear is that it would be allowed to end up like the Merry-Go-Round did many years ago. We want it to continue as a successful public house restaurant with function rooms and a vital amenity to the local neighbourhood but to do this needs careful thought from both planners and developers. I am sure that when the Merry-Go-Round was built it was for the best possible intentions. Please do not repeat the same mistakes. We are trusting that both parties are planning for the best long-term future of the area and not just a quick short-term solution. Please do not let us down.</p>	It is hoped that the public house will form a focal point for the community facilities.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	It exceeds the building line of Cattishall / Great Barton, thus creates an encroaching urban sprawl .Against Policy CSt This land for development (SS94) is in the Parish of Great Barton and does not adhere to LDF & Core Strategy policies. Boundary's are for a reason and not to be pushed or broken to enable under belly urban sprawl into East / Gt Barton towards Thurston. Where is the divide / buffer the rail way is not it to the NE and to the East? This building boundary marks a new milestone in the extent of BSE / Moreton Hall and by doing so lets another developer "spring board" future development North East of the railway line into Great Barton. As there will be a "new building line" to work too / frOILL	Although situated within parishes, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds. Concerns about design and urban sprawl are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	Address issues through the masterplan process
					Some land designated for industrial development (Which far exceeds what is required up to & after 2031) should be used to reduce the building line & density of houses on what will be the furthest distance from the town centre & fly's in the face of "policy" regarding a shift away from the car as a primary means of transport. The Train Station Halt has been "Killed Off "by SCC & Network Rail. The current & ongoing transport issues should be resolved "conclusively" i.e. bus route (s) & long-term providers prior to building		
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	Provided there are infrastructure improvements.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This expansion is onto valuable crop land, which should be used for the production of food, fuel and material. Moreton Hall should not expand any further than its current boundaries.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21079E	Annabel Mayer			no	I think that the current boundaries completely incorporate both the village of great Barton and particularly the hamlet of Cattishall within the planned development. This is a great shame as it means that the village will completely lose its identity to the disadvantage of all its residents. Very careful consideration needs to be given to how the development is planned carried out to reduce the negative impact as far as possible.	The development to the north of mount Road will relate to that proposed on the south side of mount Road, rather than the existing hamlet of Cattishall. However, screening and planting will be required to reinforce this. This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21342E	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae		Smiths Gore				
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Must not enlarge on existing development boundaries i.e. NO new developments on fields/green areas	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	Moreton hall does not need to expand any more than it has already. This proposal gives no protection to Cherry Trees and Ambleside which are part of the parish of Great Barton, not Moreton Hall.	It is acknowledged that these two properties will experience a change in outlook.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	This area is already overdeveloped and cannot cope with more housing unless there are significant infrastructure improvements	The concept of the area being overdeveloped is not accepted. Development will require improvements in infrastructure.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	Too many houses in small area. Less houses more space between them, bigger gardens, wider roadways, cycle parks.	Development should include a range of densities. Too much low density development consumes more land.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough				URBAN SPRAWL UNABATED. WHERE IS THE RESPECT FOR SETTLEMENT IDENTITY / BUFFER .THIS IS TRULY NOW INTO GREAT BARTON. SHOULD BE REVIEW AND CORRECTED BY SEPTEMBER 2012	Although situated within parishes, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds. Concerns about design and urban sprawl are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The area for the school should be immediately to the south of the football facility and not under the flight path. Land currently designated for industrial development should be used and the spread of land needed for housing can then be reduced. The location of this development at some distance from the town centre is in direct contradiction to the principles regarding a modal shift away from car usage. In particular the emphasis on affordable homes will require more facilities and a greater contribution in terms of infrastructure support than required for areas closer to the town. However, if the Council is prepared to provide the necessary support and infrastructure I would support the provision of affordable housing as a part of any further development on the estate.	The relocation of the school as suggested would have no beneficial impact. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. The area is no further from the town centre than other outlying areas of the town. However, it does have the advantage of existing infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians to access the town centre, unlike other areas. Additional facilities such as a secondary school will assist in removing the need to travel elsewhere.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	Extension of the town too far East - creating a skew to the town centre.	Development to the east is similar to that to the north and west.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The school should be built immediately to the south of the football facility and not under the flight path. Has any research been conducted as to the additional traffic caused by the new school. How many new cars will it bring onto the estate each morning when the estate is already struggling to cope with the traffic requirements?	The relocation of the school as suggested would have no beneficial impact. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Although a school will create inward journeys from elsewhere, it will remove a significant number of journeys which are currently undertaken at peak times to access the existing schools on the west side if the town centre from Moreton Hall.	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no	The area is already over developed and needs a greater green barrier between Moreton Hall and the surrounding villages.	The concept of the area being overdeveloped is not accepted. Protection of surrounding villages will be addressed in the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Building line promotes Urban Sprawl. It goes under Great Barton and Over Rougham and is NOW firmly in the Parish of East Barton & now breaks the First Village / Hamlets Building Line out of Bury St Edmunds.	Although situated within parishes, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds. Concerns about design and urban sprawl are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	Moreton Hall is already a sprawling mass. Don't make it worse.	Concerns about design and urban sprawl are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptekeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 6: Moreton Hall Bury St Edmunds (BV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer			no	It will just make Moreton Hall a connection between Bury St. Edmunds and Thurston. It should however be its own place not a connection.	There is more than adequate separation between Moreton Hall and Thurston	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	The area between Mount Road and the railway line contains a small number of rural properties which will be swamped by any new development. Developing beyond the level crossing approach road creates a development "corridor" for future extensions to the East of Bury St Edmunds. The development area contains currently productive arable land and borders further productive farming fields. No decision to develop in this area should be made until the long term future of the Rougham Airfield site has been established. Previous areas of Moreton Hall remain undeveloped because of "flight path" restrictions. These areas could be developed first, which would make more sense, if the restrictions are removed at some future point.	Any development to the north of Mount Road will impact upon the two properties currently present. The principle of development in this area has been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. Development cannot be held in abeyance pending a hypothetical change in an adjacent land use.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Encroaches on existing settlements and identity will be lost	Development will affect the setting of two properties.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	Again Moreton Hall is already too large and too separate form the town.	Do not agree that Moreton Hall is too large. It contains good direct pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	<p>There will probably be no need for a relocated health "campus". WSH occupies a big site that will be difficult to re-develop if it leaves, and there is no indication that the current model of small DGHs providing general secondary healthcare is one that will survive the next 20 years. The needs of the ageing population will be for community health and social care, and the trend towards providing this started years ago.</p> <p>This means that there will be more space for housing / amenity land in the West Bury development area, or alternatively a better buffer between it and Westley village.</p>	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers. If it proves not to be required at a later date, then the site can be reappraised. In the meantime, it should be protected from all other forms of development.	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no	<p>The boundaries should be created only when the buffer zone has been agreed.</p> <p>The boundary includes all the land owned by Mr Underwood, which I guess in turn means this land is potential housing not yet shown.</p> <p>Westley Hall Farm has been ignored, which makes no sense to me. This should be included in the overall scheme</p>	The revised boundaries have been determined following public consultation and the creation of a concept statement which will inform a masterplan. The concept statement defines the extent of housing, which excludes the visually sensitive land on the south facing slope at the south of the area.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't think you should permit an extension of the suburbs around the town. In particular, I don't think you should spoil the attractive village of Westley by permitting so much development there. You actually say on p.13 of your document that 'Existing surrounding settlements will be protected from coalescence and have green buffer zones developed between them and Bury St Edmunds to maintain their integrity'. I think the proposal for Westley is contrary to this statement.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Policy BV1 is in direct conflict with Policy 4b of the Development Management document that was consulted upon earlier in 2012. That policy states that new development will only be permitted where 'it will not result in the irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)'. It is certain that the greenfield land in the SE Bury region is Grade 3a, and the same is probably true for the other greenfield sites proposed. We are advised that SEBC will circumvent this 'inconvenient truth' by simultaneous adoption of the Development Management and Vision 2031 documents, but it is exactly this sort of administrative manoeuvre that undermines public confidence in and respect for the planning process. Furthermore, the proposed massive expansion onto greenfield sites is directly contrary to views raised in the Core Strategy consultation about coalescence, overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion.	It is accepted that the strategic growth areas will use higher grade agricultural land. There is no lower grade land around Bury St Edmunds. However, this does not conflict with the emerging Development Management Document as the policy referred to relates to countryside outside the housing settlement boundary. The land identified for strategic growth in the Core Strategy and located within the housing settlement boundary by this policy will not be classified as countryside.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	We suggest hospital is re-located to north of A14 junction to allow for its future expansion. The area allocated for the hospital could be retained as open space. We suggest plans include a park & ride facility close to A14.	The location of the new hospital has already been determined by the adopted Core Strategy. The potential for park and ride can be explored further.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15915	Mr John & Mrs Lynn Foster			no	Westley Village Parish Council has prepared a comprehensive response to the SEBC Vision 2031 document. After a series of consultations, it has been fully endorsed by the whole village. Additionally, as a committee member (JF) of the 'Westley Save The Village Campaign', I fully support the Westley Parish Council views. My wife is in agreement too. WPC has produced a series of proposals which merit detailed examination and consideration by SEBC for inclusion in the Vision 2031 document. We have both been contributors to the WPC document, which responds to all the questions posed by SEBC.	We acknowledge the views of the Parish Council and these will be developed further in the preparation of a masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Map should show proposed relief road and green/open space	These details are included on the concept statement which will be developed further in the preparation of a masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Clear failure to regard implications for and the situation of the village of Westley; see answers as above. Need to consider landscape, heritage and archaeological issues	The implications for Westley have been fully regarded. The other details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	The extent of the boundaries is not the primary concern, more the use to which the land is put, and what protections will be applied to uphold the importance expressed within Vision 2031 (which we strongly agree with) namely avoiding coalescence. The piece of land at the south, the Underwood property needs to also be designated as Strategic Amenity (see later comment on Appendix 7 and Q.46) The Westley Hall Farm piece of land should be acquired, to become part of the buffer zone and strategic amenity space. West of Bury needs its own Nowton Park equivalent and not just a few football pitches squeezed into a few remaining acres on the edge of a densely populated development. (see later comment on Appendix 7 and Q.46)	These details are included on the concept statement which will be developed further in the preparation of a masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15956	Miss Caroline Pettitt			no	No more houses on this plot. It should be kept for farmland or for allotments. Bury should not come any closer to Westley than it already has.	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Looks to join the town with Westley. Agree that development in this area is as good as any but care should be taken in protecting the boundaries of our surrounding villages	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Unnecessary and far too big.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15966	Mr J B Brennan			no	Proposed boundaries would eliminate Westley as an individual village.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	yes	We support the boundary of the West of Bury St Edmunds site to meet the needs of Core Strategy DPD Policy CS11.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15968	Mrs I M Brennan			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree but only when funding for the new hospital site is confirmed	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no	This map makes no mention of the 'Buffer Zone' allocated on previous maps. Lack of coalescence and a road were 'promised' for Westley village in previous documents and must be mentioned again. Accordingly the boundaries to the west shown in BV4 are not a true representation of the development area. If the boundaries shown were to be agreed with, then there could be development adjacent to the existing village houses.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15977	Jane Watson			no	To include the bulge of land between the railway line and the roundabout.	This area is physically separated from the site by the railway, which forms a significant barrier. Such an area would be isolated and would not integrate with existing development.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes	Hospital only	This support is welcomed, although the housing element is equally important.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The Parish Council have reservations about agreeing to this with the boundary extremely close to the settlement village. The buffer to maintain the identity of the village must be started at the allocation stage to afford protection from any part of the development. Time scales must be stipulated within the developers Masterplan.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The proposed HSB is unacceptable as it removes the separation between Westley and the neighbouring estate.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. The housing settlement boundary has been amended to reflect this. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Amend position of housing settlement boundary.
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You are not keeping 'green' land between development/town and villages.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	Another existing housing estate we do not need. Will increase traffic congestion - specially at commuter time from A14. Does not take into account increase in population, schools, GP facilities and church. Will affect wildlife/birdlife.	The need for this development is already established. Other issues are addressed by the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I do not agree with the expansion as shown. A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	The option of a new settlement as an alternative, was considered early in the preparation of the Core Strategy and dismissed.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not object to the development boundary of this site, but we would advise that this option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society is very concerned that the proposed allocation would result in settlement coalescence with the existing community becoming subsumed into a western suburb. The Society acknowledges the strategic importance of the existing hospital facility and the provision of improved and extended facilities is welcomed. However, the Society is concerned that the closure of the existing hospital site would reduce accessibility and increase dependence on private transport. In any event, the Society wishes to see continued public benefit derived from future uses on the existing hospital site.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. Accessibility of the hospital, not just from within Bury St Edmunds but the whole of West Suffolk is a requirement which will need to be addressed.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23,27,28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, would remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes. The pleasant approach to the Town from the west along Westley Road will be ruined by the planned housing estate to the north. . Hospital We also object to the relocation of west Suffolk Hospital to Westley. We believe it is quite unrealistic and inappropriate to place the hospital in a village location a number of miles from Bury. It would no longer be easily accessible for the majority of town residents.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			We believe the Hospital Foundation should follow the lead of other hospitals and concentrate its efforts on developing the existing site. With innovative thinking and design, the existing spaces can be developed and additional storeys can be added to many parts of the hospital buildings, particularly those which are only one or two storeys. With care in the community coming on stream, day surgery and other health initiatives, there will be shorter periods for in-patients thus reducing the need for increased bed capacity. If the expansion of the town is moderated, this will of course decrease the pressure for the move.	The hospital serves a sub-regional purpose for the whole of West Suffolk, not just Bury St Edmunds. The location is not many miles from Bury St Edmunds, it is within walking distance of the town centre.	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	Provided there is a "buffer Zone" between the development and Westley.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This is valuable crop land, which we need for production of food, fuel and material, for a sustainable future. The boundary of Bury should not encroach on the boundaries of our local villages, such a Westley.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	b Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21342E	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae		Smiths Gore	no	We do not agree with the boundaries for the West Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map for the following reasons: Whilst we support the strategic site option and believe that it should be allocated, we believe the land immediately to the west of BV4 (Westley Hall Farm) which is owned by our client should form an integral part of this strategic development site, and must be considered in conjunction with it. Therefore we object to the detailed site boundary shown on the West Bury St Edmunds strategic site plan.	The proximity of the site to the village of Westley is such, that if it was to be included, it would most likely be protected from development as part of the strategic buffer zone between Westley and Bury St Edmunds. Westley itself is identified in the adopted Core Strategy as countryside, so does not have a housing settlement boundary.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				The Westley Hall Farm land (2ha) is located to the north east of Westley village on the western outskirts of Bury St Edmunds. The land lies adjacent to and is wholly encompassed by the West Bury development site outlined as a preferred option in the Vision 2031 document. Westley Hall Farm itself is agricultural land which lies fairly flat. The land has no distinct boundaries and is contiguous with the West Bury development site, specifically the area outlined for strategic amenity space and structural landscaping. For this reason it is illogical in planning terms as to why the site has not been included in this allocation. We strongly believe that the site should be considered in conjunction with the development site as a possible further strategic amenity space in order that the area is planned comprehensively. At present the Plan has no proposed use for the site and by allocating Westley Hall Farm for a positive use it would provide certainty to landowners, residents and neighbours.	Therefore, should the site be included within the strategic growth area as part of the buffer zone, it will not require the re-drawing of the housing settlement boundary.	
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				It is apparent from studying the detailed site boundary shown on the West Bury St Edmunds strategic site plan (pg.26) that generally the red line runs clearly along the eastern edge of the built settlement boundary of Westley, travelling along Fornham Lane in the north to Mill Road located in the south of the village. However, the plan evidently shows that there is an exception and effectively excludes the Westley Hall Farm land from being incorporated within the strategic site boundary. In planning terms, this is an unsound and inconsistent approach to the definition of the BV4 boundary, and we strongly believe that the Westley Hall Farm land should be integrated within the development site.		
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				Within the south western corner of the Westley Hall Farm land exists a traditional farm building (see photograph 4) and a grain store (see photographs 1, 2 and 3). The farm building is currently disused but the grain store could potentially be re-used. If allocated as part of the strategic development site the redundant traditional farm building could potentially be re-used and converted for recreational or commercial use consistent with an area of strategic open space e.g. cafe, toilets, bike hire. The re-use of the grain store would not be particularly compatible with the planned development.		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				The land is linked in to the village of Westley via a track which leads to Fornham Lane which acts as the main route running through the village (see photograph 5). If the land was included as part of the strategic development site this could function as an important pedestrian and cycle link connecting Westley village to the hospital, development site, and Bury further to the east. This will essentially improve connectivity and linkages between the development site and Westley by providing another pedestrian/cycle link as at present the preferred option only shows one. Furthermore, it would also meet a key policy objective as outlined in Policy CS11 in the adopted Core Strategy provide improved public transport, foot and cycle links to the town centre.		
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				One of the key policy objectives outlined in adopted Core Strategy Policy CS11 is to maintain the identity and segregation of Westley from Bury St Edmunds. If Westley Hall Farm land is included within the strategic development site, this will allow a comprehensive development to be provided, with this land forming part of a band of open space along the western edge of the site. This will be of particular importance in order to meet the key policy objective and provide adequate and permanent separation between the development and Westley. If the site is not included (as per the current proposals) it will effectively result in an agricultural island surrounded by developed uses which would seem a very odd approach in planning terms. This is clearly illustrated in the preferred option figure on pg. 78 of the Bury Vision document which clearly shows the hospital site, amenity space, residential and Westley Hall Farm, which sits awkwardly outside of the allocation.		
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				The Westley Hall Farm land is in single ownership, available and deliverable. In order to ensure proper and comprehensive planning of the Strategic Development Site it should form an integral part of the strategic development site and it should be allocated as part of an area of strategic open space or strategic landscaping. We have therefore enclosed a plan Proposal Map Changes Policy BV4: Strategic Site West Bury St Edmunds to indicate the changes we think should be made to the site boundary.		
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Must not enlarge on existing development boundaries i.e. NO new developments on fields/green areas	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	Less valuable farmland should be used for development	There is no less valuable farmland around Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Less valuable farmland should be used for development	There is no less valuable farmland around Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	DIANE HIND	ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL - NORTHGATE WARD		no opinion	I have insufficient knowledge to comment	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	cut size down by half and create green gap between Westley and town	This suggestion is addressed in the concept statement which will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21607E	Mr. r h footer			no	scrap the plans completely more traffic on Newmarket road will make the town gridlocked	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no	We are concerned about the land to the southern boundary which is dissected by the relief road but otherwise is not protected from further development. This needs to be retained as strategic amenity. Similarly the boundary should be extended to include the area of Westley Hall Farm to become part of the buffer zone and amenity space.	The revised boundaries have been determined following public consultation and the creation of a concept statement which will inform a masterplan. The concept statement defines the extent of housing, which excludes the visually sensitive land on the south facing slope at the south of the area.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	The plans outlined and the consultation process have been poor. Concepts suggested at meetings and feedback from residents does not appear to have been taken into account in preparing this plan. The hospital relocation is a 'wish-list' and may not even happen. Thus further housing may appear on the site.	The information received from this consultation has informed the revised concept statement which will be developed further in the masterplan. The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers. If it proves not to be required at a later date, then the site can be reappraised. In the meantime, it should be protected from all other forms of development.	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 7: West Bury St Edmunds (BV4)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the west Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 7b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no	This site comes too close to Westley. One of the aims stated in this Vision is to prevent villages becoming part of the main town.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	Again Moreton Hall is already too large and too separate from the town.	This development is proposed to the west of the town, not Moreton Hall.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15710	Michael Murray			no	1. Nowhere in any plans, proposals, options or preferences have I seen a mention of road improvements to accommodate the undoubted extra traffic. The central and east junctions to access the A14 are already a nightmare during busy periods from the north of Bury and to add 1250 homes to this area would be catastrophic. 2. It will make the village of Great Barton and the Cattishall area in particular an extension of Morton Hall. The proposed development should be less construction and more environmental screening to protect the village from becoming another 'Milton Keynes'.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall together with access and highway matters are requirements of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15782	D A Howell			no	I consider that this is a creeping policy which will in time remove Great Barton as an entity other than in name only. Retaining Great Barton as it is will, I hope, mean that residents of Great Barton will have some say in development of our village rather than being told what will happen by Bury St Edmunds Council.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	No, for the same reason as above, that it is permitting an extension of the suburbs around the town.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15795	Jean and John Sale			no	1. Gt. Barton is a Suffolk village and we would like it to retain this status and NOT become a suburb of Bury St. Edmunds. 2. The proposed expansion as demonstrated by Berkeley Strategic Land does not show a revised road network which would be essential to cope with the additional traffic involved. A satisfactory road scheme needs to be worked out in conjunction with planned housing and no building should commence until the necessary roads are on place. 3. Berkeley Strategic Land states that a new primary school and doctor's surgery would be incorporated in the expansion, but no mention is made of how the existing further education establishments, hospital, etc. are to cope with the additional demands made on them.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall together with highway and other infrastructure matters are requirements of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered: 1 The Great Barton bypass should linked to junction 44 of A14 2 Replace the existing Orttewell rail bridge currently restricted to single file traffic	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	<p>Policy BV1 is in direct conflict with Policy 4b of the Development Management document that was consulted upon earlier in 2012. That policy states that new development will only be permitted where 'it will not result in the irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)'. It is certain that the greenfield land in the SE Bury region is Grade 3a, and the same is probably true for the other greenfield sites proposed. We are advised that SEBC will circumvent this 'inconvenient truth' by simultaneous adoption of the Development Management and Vision 2031 documents, but it is exactly this sort of administrative manoeuvre that undermines public confidence in and respect for the planning process.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed massive expansion onto greenfield sites is directly contrary to views raised in the Core Strategy consultation about coalescence, overdevelopment and resultant traffic congestion.</p> <p>In addition, development on this site is likely to cause massive congestion at the single lane underpass beneath the railway line in Orttewell Road</p>	It is accepted that the strategic growth areas will use higher grade agricultural land. There is no lower grade land around Bury St Edmunds. However, this does not conflict with the emerging Development Management Document as the policy referred to relates to countryside outside the housing settlement boundary. The land identified for strategic growth in the Core Strategy and located within the housing settlement boundary by this policy will not be classified as countryside.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered:</p> <p>1 If the Great Barton bypass only takes the A143 around the village it will merely speed the traffic into the congestion around the Orttewell Road roundabout. The bypass should be linked to the improved Rookery junction of the A14.</p> <p>2 Replace the existing rail bridge to enable two-way traffic.</p>	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15808	Alison and John Baines			no	<p>We live at 5 Winsford Road and quite often use Orttewell Road to access the A143 north of Bury. The reduction to one lane under the railway bridge results in a bottleneck which at busy times stretches back to the A143 roundabout as we experienced today around 5.30pm.</p> <p>We believe that unless two way traffic can be safely reinstated, further extra housing should not be built on Moreton Hall - and housing for N. E. Bury north of the railway line in the Great Barton direction should not even be contemplated.</p>	Such highway improvements require a holistic approach as improvements to one problem area may just move that problem elsewhere or create new problems. A traffic assessment is being carried out for the whole town.	No changes required
BVR15812	Cattishall Residents c/o Mrs Joanna Meyer	Cattishall Residents	John Popham Planning	no	<p>Please see detailed response in accompanying Objection. In summary the reasons for objection stem from the fact that the site has been enlarged from 40ha to 66.5ha, and while it will theoretically receive the same number of dwellings (1,250) no guarantees are given that the site will be adequately landscaped in a manner which respects the character of the area and protects and enhances its visual and wildlife qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides a proper setting for the proposed development; provides a buffer between the area to be developed and the wider agricultural landscape of the parish to the east, and the built settlement of Great Barton to the north-east, and affords adequate and appropriate protection for the Cattishall Residents which is in place and of sufficient maturity to provide adequate cover at the time work commences on site. 	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall together with highway and other infrastructure matters are requirements of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered: 1 If the Great Barton bypass only takes the A143 around the village it will merely speed the traffic into the congestion around the Orttewell Road roundabout. The bypass should be linked to the improved Rookery junction of the A14. 2 Replace the existing rail bridge to enable two-way traffic.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	* It totally takes in Cattishall Hamlet to the very front doors of the residents. * Against all policy. No protection of settlement identity * Where is the policy CS1 policy law. * It is not the previous plan which was SS48 which was the same volume of build etc * Growth has moved a further an extra 26.5 Ha * This is the only development with continually moving boundaries * ALL OTHER BOUNDARIES HAVE REMAINED STATIC. This is all UNACCEPTABLE and short be reviewed with concern to its legality	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall together with highway and other infrastructure matters are requirements of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15914	The Hon James Broughton	Barton Stud		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Map should show road improvements and green/open space.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Answers as above for Questions Need to consider landscape, heritage and archaeological issues	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Traffic will require infrastructure changes bypass and new railbridge (Orttewell Rd)	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	Berkeley is the strategic developer for this site. The red line boundary proposed in Policy BV5 concurs with our own analysis and assessment to date in terms of: 1.The optimum landscape capacity of the area identified broadly within the Core Strategy Policy CS11. 2.The quantum of land (c.66 Ha) required to deliver the targets under Policy CS11. 3.The feedback from community engagement. We would submit that the red line boundary for the site will be subject to masterplanning consultation ahead of and in parallel with the consultation on the second draft Action Plan due in Autumn this year. This will be particularly in terms of the eastern extent relative to Cattishall which will benefit from more focused design consultation to feed into the wider masterplanning consultation.	This support is welcomed. The issues raised can be addressed through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>Should the masterplanning consultation recommend adjustments to the red line boundary we will make representations on this in response to the next drafts of the Action Plan and would therefore wish to reserve our position in this regard.</p> <p>We would also point out that the red line boundary includes an area of land adjoining Orttewell Road which is assumed to be within the ownership of the Highway Authority. This land is constrained on all three sides by the railway line, Orttewell Road/Bury Road and a well-established line of conifer trees.</p> <p>We submit that this land should not take access onto Orttewell Road or Bury Road and instead be masterplanned for uses in support of:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The gateway entrance to Bury St Edmunds and the Compiegne Way corridor towards the A14. 2. Improvements in traffic flows, pedestrian and cycle routes in the Orttewell Road / Bury Road / Compiegne Way area. 		
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Will require a bypass and new railway bridge.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15952	David Creek			no	The proposed site will do nothing but create extra problems at rush hour with increased road traffic. Great Barton road problems should be sorted out before proposal goes ahead.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	<p>The area proposed for development in this area has increased throughout the Vision exercise. No limit appears to have been placed on the number of houses required. The SEBC have indeed, handed the developer an extra 26.5 hectares of land for development without consultation with the local community.</p> <p>Development in this area is contrary to the principles of the vision documents as the developer have expanded their site area to the boundary of the Cattishall hamlet. Any development up to the boundary of Cattishall is contrary to the Vision document where existing communities should not be interfered with.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	<p>The area proposed for development in this area has increased throughout the Vision exercise. No limit appears to have been placed on the number of houses required. The SEBC have indeed, handed the developer an extra 26.5 hectares of land for development without consultation with the local community.</p> <p>Development in this area is contrary to the principles of the vision documents as the developer have expanded their site area to the boundary of the Cattishall hamlet. Any development up to the boundary of Cattishall is contrary to the Vision document where existing communities should not be interfered with.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is ever considered. This side of town is already overcrowded and over developed. All traffic would enter town via already blocked roads, especially the rail bridge nearby, and the A14 interchange by the Sugar Factory. The rail bridge has long needed to be made wider to accommodate 2 way traffic, deleting the traffic lights which simply cause a bottleneck.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes	As long as it does not include the country park in the 'preferred option' as this (with amenities) will not be a true 'buffer' for Great Barton as existing farmland would be.	A country park can create an effective buffer as well as provide significant amenity benefit for the community.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	The proposed boundary must be moved back. I would like to see a strong buffer i.e woodland between Cattishall, Great Barton and the proposed development. Cattishall is an important historic hamlet and should retain its identity. Ideally would like to see the boundary moved back to the old footpath.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	Do not agree with the proposed development but if it has to happen the boundary should be moved back to the old footpath which went across from the bridle path to under the railway line. This was your original proposal!! Plan SS48	SS48 was a proposal submitted to the council for consideration, it was not a council proposal.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The Parish Council have deep reservations surrounding the area designated and with the boundary extremely close to the settlement of Cattishall even though the village core has been afforded some protection by a 'buffer'. Firstly, I draw your attention to The Site Submission Form from the Developer in April/May 2008 when Berkeley Strategic proposed at least 1000 homes covering 40Ha which included a range of community facilities, including a new primary school, formal and informal public open space, highway and public transport infrastructure. This document can be viewed on the SEBC LDF website. Therefore the development could be accommodated in a reduced area than proposed under Policy BV5 covering 66.5Ha. A buffer would still be required to comply with the Core Strategy to maintain the identity of this hamlet and must be started at the allocation stage to afford protection from any part of the development.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan, which will build upon the existing dialogue which includes the Parish Council and residents.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			Even though this proposed area is larger than identified in previous planning strategy documents (as documented above) the landscaping proposal would not compromise the indicated housing numbers. To demonstrate concern we draw your attention to the Landscaping Proposal for Cattishall from those parishioners and the Parish Council as a strategic landscaping buffer for Cattishall hamlet. This complies with the Core Strategy and can be viewed on the Great Barton Village web site: www.greatbarton.onesuffolk.net/vision-2031 To allow a full appraisal of Policy BV5 and with Appendix 8 from the Developer I must also refer you to the document submitted by the residents of Cattishall and fully supported by this Parish Council undertaken by John Popham Planning. This document is attached with this word document for ease of referencing.		
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The boundary will allow another 1250 houses plus commercial development that will have an adverse effect on Moreton Hall and on Gt Barton. In effect this is expansion of Moreton Hall by stealth as the only separation is the railway. Briefings by developers signal they have no intention of dealing with the rail bridge pinch-point and councils continue to ignore the congestion caused.	This development is quite separate from Moreton Hall, although pedestrian links will be possible between the two. Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You are not keeping 'green' land between development/town and villages.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no	The so called Compeigne Way development is in fact on Bury Road and would add considerably to the congestion on the 143. We need a bypass.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Congestion! Quality of life of existing residents.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I do not agree with the expansion as shown. A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	The option of a new settlement as an alternative, was considered early in the preparation of the Core Strategy and dismissed.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not object to the development boundary of this site, but we would advise that this option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that development to the north of the existing railway line will be difficult to integrate with the greater town and could exacerbate existing congestion on the A143. The impact upon Cattishall as a small distinctive hamlet needs greater consideration together with the setting of the important medieval church. The Society believes that the suggested density is simply too great for their peripheral location abutting an open arable landscape. Any development in this location must facilitate the creation of a sustainable community as opposed to an isolated suburban housing estate. It is essential that any development in this location makes adequate provision for local employment opportunities and education to build a new viable community. In our opinion, Cattishall needs to be respected and this must be reflected in the retention of a significant landscape setting for the hamlet.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	no	Whilst it is acknowledged that long-term strategic growth of Bury St Edmunds is broadly identified within a north-east direction (on the Core Strategy Key Diagram and in Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy), we object to the proposed boundary of the strategic site identified on the map at page 26 and within Policy BV5 and the developer's preferred option set out in Chapter 16. Our objection relates to the issues associated with the location of the new housing development, which might adversely affect the continuing operation and future growth of the factory site. Our concerns and objections to the location of the housing allocation as defined under Policy BV5 are based on the following grounds:	The principle of strategic growth to the north east of Bury St Edmunds is established by the adopted Core Strategy. The location identified by Policy BV5 is well related to existing development and at the furthest point from the British Sugar operation. It is acknowledged that the operation of the sugar plant does produce odours at different times of the year, which vary according to the operation being undertaken and proximity to the plant. The location of the proposed development could be affected by the winter processing of beet, as can all existing parts of the town, but to no greater or lesser extent.	No changes required
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour sensitive development being located near the factory, which might give rise to problems with the factory becoming the subject of complaint, thereby affecting the operations of the factory and placing significant burdens on British Sugar. • Impact on the traffic capacity of the existing road network, which might affect the essential lorry movements to and from the factory. • Cumulative air quality impact, arising from traffic generation. 	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		As you are aware, pollution impacts such as odour, noise and air quality from new and existing commercial and industrial premises are controlled by both planning and pollution control regimes. With regard to the control exercised by the planning regime, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution should be taken into account. Therefore, an allocation of new residential development must be carefully considered, having regard to the following.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		<p>Odour Nuisance</p> <p>British Sugar holds an Environmental Permit, which allows the factory to discharge vapour waste via the main stack plume. The Permit limits emission of the plume to a certain level. British Sugar, as a responsible and experienced operator of factories of this scale, takes potential impact on neighbouring residents seriously and seeks to manage and control its operation to minimise any adverse impact. As such, there have been no serious issues or complaints from local residents that have not been resolved. However, the odour from the plume coupled with the 'pond area' of the factory gives rise to potential odour nuisance issues relative to the predominant winds - which blow in the direction of the proposed allocation for housing development at the A143 Compiegne Way. British Sugar regularly monitors the wind direction, which confirms that the odours from the plume and the pond area generally spread over towards the proposed residential allocation site on a regular basis.</p>		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		<p>We note that comments made by a third party on the proposed housing allocation, during the consultation on the site allocations issues and options stage, expressed concerns that smells from the British Sugar factory, carried across the proposed housing site by winds, would lead to an uncomfortable environment for residential occupants of the development. Clearly these comments were not taken into consideration. As you are no doubt aware, under the relevant pollution control regimes, nuisances caused by odours are regulated by the statutory nuisance provision of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA), and the Local Authority has powers and duties under these provisions. Under the provisions of the EPA, any smell arising from industrial and business premises being prejudicial to a nuisance falls within its definition of 'a statutory nuisance.'</p>		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		<p>The Local Authority Environmental Health Services have a duty to investigate any complaint about alleged odour nuisance made by local residents. Once they have formed the view that a statutory nuisance exists, the local authority is under a duty to serve an abatement notice. Needless to say, such investigations and necessary works to avoid an abatement notice being served can place significant burden on British Sugar, which will inevitably affect the longstanding and future operation of the factory, particularly during the 'campaign' period. DEFRA's guidance entitled 'Odour Guidance for Local Authorities' (2007) contains clear advice to Local Authorities to give careful consideration to the location of new odour sensitive developments, including residential use to existing odour sources.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		It states that: 'Encroachment of odour sensitive development around such sites (existing odour sources) may lead to problems with the site becoming the subject of complaint, essentially creating a problem where there was not one before.' It can be said, therefore, that the proposed location of the new housing area could create a new issue relative to odour matters or similar, which is likely to involve a lengthy and costly process for British Sugar to defend its factory operations, if it is found that there is a statutory nuisance, (outside of planning control). Such a risk will affect British Sugar's operations and potential investment in business growth in the future. In these terms, it is considered that the proposed housing allocation at the A143 Compiègne Way has the potential to significantly affect the operations of the factory. We consider that this should be wholly unacceptable, and against the provisions of the NPPF to ensure that the planning system does all it can to support economic growth and, more particularly, the food industry.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		Having reviewed the sustainability appraisal for the allocation, it does not appear that the potential odour issues have been considered. On this basis, at this stage, there is no adequate evidence to suggest that these issues have been considered as part of defining the strategic growth allocation. In these terms, the proposed allocation is premature and not based on robust evidence, and should be removed.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		Traffic Impact - Lorry Movements As detailed above, during the campaign period, the factory's operations involve a significant number of lorry deliveries (of sugar beet) from 1,200 farmers in the catchment area. British Sugar monitors those lorry movements, and confirms that during the campaign period, around 20% of the total delivery lorries would travel along the A143, passing the proposed strategic housing site. It is noted that the Core Strategy seeks to reduce congestion at the A14 Junction, and to facilitate the provision of an A143 Great Barton bypass relative to, and perhaps as an enabling work for, the housing development proposed at the Compiègne Way site. Whilst the provision of an A143 bypass would be facilitated by the development, it is not clear, from the site allocation proposed, whether the existing traffic capacity of Great Barton is sufficient enough for such large scale development to proceed, taking into account - inter alia - the number of existing lorry movements required by British Sugar.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		However, we assume that this matter has not yet been considered, as it is identified as a key challenge to be addressed in bringing forward the development of the area (at Paragraph 16.25). Additionally, notwithstanding the policy aspiration to reduce congestion at the A14 Junction, any major development in this area would put further pressure on the traffic capacity of the existing road network, particularly the A14 Junction, which is part of British Sugar's lorry delivery network. Therefore, we are concerned that the proposed allocation under Policy BV5 has the potential to affect the essential lorry deliveries required by British Sugar and has not been addressed in any substantive way in the plan's evidence base.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		It is understood that the Core Strategy was found to be sound on the basis that measures required to mitigate possible increases of traffic and capacity issues can be addressed through the development of the Area Action Plan (i.e. the Vision 2031), and further detailed planning for strategic growth locations. It is noted from the developer's supporting information appended to the Vision 2031, that further analysis of, and consultation on, improvements to the A14 and the A143, and the southern alignment of a Great Barton relief Road have yet to be undertaken. We consider that there is the potential that the proposed allocation could significantly hinder the future operations of the factory if the proposed housing allocation were to proceed without a proper analysis of the required highway improvements, and we object to it in those terms.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		Impact on Air Quality We understand that air quality in Great Barton was assessed in detail in November 2009. At that time, the annual mean air quality objective was found to be at risk of being exceeded along a section of the A143 (as it passes through the village of Great Barton). The assessment concludes that objectives for nitrogen dioxide are exceeded in certain locations along the A143. Additionally, we note that certain locations of the A14 have been declared an air quality management area. Clearly, any significant additional traffic in these areas would mean an increase of pollutants which will worsen the air quality of these areas. This could prevent the future business growth and enhancement of the factory which may involve increased capacity to process sugar beet. We therefore request the Council to consider these matters in advance of allocating a suitable development site.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		Sustainability Appraisal The sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy Policy CS11 (Strategic Growth) assessed effects of five major strategic sites collectively. Therefore, the appraisal failed to consider and address site specific issues relating specifically to the proposed strategic housing site at the A143. The sustainability appraisal for the Vision 2031 Policy BV5 assesses the proposed development's effects a site specific basis. However, we object to the assessment undertaken for the preferred option document, as it fails to address key economic effects - that is the effects on the existing industries and businesses.		
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		These issues are fundamental, and must be addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal. As detailed above, if these key issues are not properly addressed, and the proposed housing allocation proceeds, it could potentially have a damaging effect on the going operations of the British Sugar factory, which is of national importance, and valuable to the food production industry, acting as a very important local enterprise, which is significant in the employment market.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23,27,28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, would remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					
BVR16025	R D Davison	Lacy Scott & Knight			I respond on behalf of client A V Mills & Sons in respect of land located to the north of the Thurston Road and south of the main railway line located at Cattishall and designated as SS73 in the Site Allocations Issues and Options document and identified on the attached plan. The site including and together with the remainder of the area shown in Appendix 6 of the St Edmundsbury Vision 2031 for Preferred Option for residential development is well located for easy access to large areas of existing employment at Moreton Hall together with the existing Rougham Industrial Estate and the area designated for substantial employment growth at the Suffolk Business Park. Closeness to these areas will, together with rising fuel costs, encourage easy journeys by foot and cycle to local places of employment.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	R D Davison	Lacy Scott & Knight			It is clear that the site designated as "North East Bury St Edmunds" and shown as (BV5) in Question 8 has significant problems to overcome to facilitate access to the major employment areas at Moreton Hall and Suffolk Business Park as well as the town centre and it is unlikely these will be resolved before the planned substantial increase in freight traffic from Felixstowe Dock to the Midlands on the railway line separating BV5 from the area to the south. By which time the use of freight, believed to be tripling, will negate any possibility of improvement of vehicle access crossing the railway line and add major congestion to an already impractical 3 way controlled junction.. Furthermore BV5 is too remote to be considered feasible for the majority of persons to travel by foot or cycle to employment areas particularly the Suffolk Business Park. The deliverability therefore of BV5 must therefore be considered as highly questionable thereby providing an opportunity for an anticipated loss of allocation to be replaced in part at least on our client's site. SS73.	There is no requirement to provide an additional vehicular access from the site to the land identified as SS73. However, direct pedestrian access is available which will enable access to Suffolk Business Park and the proposed secondary school, which are both within easy walking and cycling distance.	No changes required
	R D Davison	Lacy Scott & Knight			Access to schools, retail facilities, doctors' surgery and local community centre, including post office, are all readily and easily achievable from SS73 without use of the motor car or placing a strain on the Bury St Edmunds A 14 east junction, 44, at peak times. The proposed relief road and A 14 improvements at the Rookery junction 45, further provide future ease of access on to this important arterial road without placing further constraints on existing junctions. This cannot be achieved by the Bury St Edmunds north east option site.		
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	There needs to be a major rethink on this development Before the Final Vision in September 2012 1) 2) Are they legal (Boundaries)? Where all other development sites Vision 203] (town) have remained "static" in size • This is the only development site that has grown in size since circa 2005 Is the "No Red Line"/ Moving Line (Always forward never back!) policy water tight. It is the only one nationwide to be used in planning. What provenance has it / legality. I can find none to date. • Nothing prior to January 2012 was said about / promoted / published about this current increased size of development land ..(66.50Ha). • Previous "Growth Maps" towards A 143. Never towards Cattishall & Holly Innocents Church & Great Barton Village.	The principle of locating strategic growth to the north east of Bury St Edmunds was established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. Reference to sites identified in 2005 has no relevance. No red lines were identified for any of the strategic growth sites until the publication of this document, so they have neither shrunk, nor grown.	No changes required
	Paul Lamplough				• Consultation on this area has not been listened too by the developer and STBC in 20 11 consultation period and that was the lesser development area of SS48 . Then SEBC gifted the extra 26.5 Ha for development (Now BV5) in January 2012 .WHY?? BV5 is the only development NOT having a Relief Road built. Yet is situated at the Funnel Neck end of the A143. A major high volume trunk road. • There is no relief road from the A 143 taking through traffic down the Compiegne Way and • Allowing local traffic to carry on through to the town & Morton Hall via Ottewell Road Bridge. • The railway bridges canU10t handle current traffic pressures •		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				Without traffic relief it will be an impossible road. A143 creating rat runs through Gt Barton & Moreton Hall How will the new development help deliver a range of improvements to address existing and growing traffic related problems. Please answer how the current road A 143 will cope with an additional "minimal" 2500+ vehicle movements a day without a highway / road improvements to the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Otterwell Road, Railway Bridge. Is currently traffic light controlled with single flow traffic. • The additional 345 houses from Hopton to Great Barton from the Vision 2031 Rural That will all use the A143 coming into Bury St Edmunds. • This will, without addressing cause "Rat Runs" through Great Barton, Mill Road, Fornham Road, East Barton Road and into Mount Road Moreton Hall. • THIS IS ALREADY HAPPENING NOW at peak times 	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Tending to impinge upon Gt Barton - could lead to ribbon development.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Retain boundary as existing, area to remain agricultural.	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This is valuable cropland, which we need for production for food, fuel and materials, for a long-term sustainable future. It should not be given over to make a short-term profit for property developers.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21079E	Annabel Mayer			no	Again, this completely incorporates the hamlet of Cattishall into the development. A proper and adequate green belt needs to be included to minimise the damage done to the hamlet.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21342E	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae		Smiths Gore				
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Must not enlarge on existing development boundaries i.e. NO new developments on fields/green areas	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R. Taylor			yes	BUT only if the boundary between Gt. Barton and the new development is protected by woodland or open space.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21528E	Sarah Papworth	Imperial College London		no	This area is not part of Bury St Edmunds and should not be made so. This area is countryside, and should be protected from development, as other countryside areas nearby have been protected. A buffer zone needs to be created to protect wildlife. There is insufficient access to this area and development will increase, rather than ease, traffic problems.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone. Buffer zones, wildlife and access are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21531E	Alice Mayer			no	I utterly disagree with the proposed boundary. The area cannot cope with the numbers of houses being proposed - there is already a water shortage in the area and its current roads cannot cope with heightened traffic. The limited access across the railway line by Ottewill Bridge to Bury St Edmunds will cause a bottleneck with nowhere for traffic to go.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
					The boundary for development should be nowhere near Cattishall; in fact, a substantial natural buffer zone such as protected woodland needs to be created between Cattishall and rural urbanisation to protect the hamlet, its ancient identity, its heritage and its wildlife. It should never become a suburb of Bury, which would happen if this proposed plan goes ahead Cattishall's countryside should be protected from urbanisation and the biodiversity of agricultural land should be protected. I grew up in Cattishall. If my family and I had wanted to live in a housing estate, we would have chosen that. Instead, we chose the countryside and it is imperative that Cattishall and the surrounding area REMAINS in the countryside.		
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21558E	Peter Turner			no	Development too large Loss of green fields No provision for highway improvements Maintain the railway line as the urban / rural boundary	The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	The boundary has doubled since the site submission of 2009/10. No credible explanation has been given for this. The hamlet of Cattishall is part of Great Barton village and as such deserves a SIGNIFICANT RURAL SEPARATION from the development. The amount of houses will have a catastrophic impact on the A143 congestion and the Ortewell Road roundabout bottleneck.	Prior to the identification of this site, there were two sites submitted to the council for consideration, SS48 and WS65. Neither site was being proposed by the council. SS48 was smaller than that now proposed, but WS65 was significantly larger. The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	This is an extension to an already overdeveloped area in Moreton Hall. There needs to be major infrastructure improvements before this can be considered and much will depend on the Great Barton bypass	Do not agree that Moreton Hall is overdeveloped. Although the site will have pedestrian access to Moreton Hall, it will have a separate and distinct identity. Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	This area has traffic problems which could become a real problem with this volume of building/people.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	TAKES THE HAMLET OF CATTISHALL INTO THE DEVELOPMENT AGAINST PLANNING POLICY.REQUIRES IMMEDIATE ATTENTION AND BOUNDARY SHOULD GO BACK TO SS48 PLAN.WHY DOES THIS DEVELOPMENT KEEP MOVING FORWARD WITH MORE LAND BUT THE SAME AMOUNT OF BUILD AS IN 2009 UNLAWFULL	Prior to the identification of this site, there were two sites submitted to the council for consideration, SS48 and WS65. Neither site was being proposed by the council. SS48 was smaller than that now proposed, but WS65 was significantly larger. The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters, including protecting the identity of Cattishall are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered: 1. If the Great Barton bypass only takes the A143 around the village it will merely speed the traffic into the congestion around the Ortwell Road roundabout. The bypass should be linked to the improved Rookery junction of the A14. 2. Replace the existing rail bridge to enable two-way traffic.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The traffic at the railway bridge on Ortwell Road is already congested and causing a bottleneck at many times throughout the day. The additional traffic from this development will cause even greater problems. The bridge MUST be widened to allow two way traffic. Attention MUST also be given to Compiegne Way from the roundabout to Tayfen Road and then Tayfen Road itself. Tayfen Road needs to be a dual carriage way.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21686E	Chloe Stuart			no	Having spent much of my childhood enjoying the beautiful, rural landscape of Cattishall, I wholeheartedly disagree with the proposed boundaries for north-east Bury St. Edmunds. Cattishall and its ancient history deserves to be protected from any kind of urbanisation. The boundary should be much closer to Bury st Edmunds and a substantial buffer zone such as protected woodland needs to be created to protect it and maintain its wildlife and biodiversity. Practically the area cannot support increased traffic and the construction of main roads and houses will destroy the charming and much-loved rural identity of Cattishall.	The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters, including protecting the identity of Cattishall are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21695E	Candyace Stuart			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no	The area is too large for the existing infrastructure to cope . So far there has been no clear statements as to how the extra traffic generated by this development is to be handled. Access to this site should be from the east via the A14 to alleviate the problems currently associated with the A143 and traffic through our village. This will only get worse with further development proposed north of the village (Ixworth) No development should be put up for consultation without full and detailed infrastructure plans (water Electricity Traffic management etc.)It is wrong that we are being asked to comment on these plans without knowing the full story.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21721E	nick hardaker			no	Keep the existing boundaries. Cattishall is a hamlet in its own right and not a suburb of Bury	The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters, including protecting the identity of Cattishall are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Why the extra 65 acres of land to build same volume as in 2010. This takes all of Cattishall and Makes us TOWN.WE ARE A HAMLET / VILLAGE Not acceptable. Other Vision Boundaries have remained the same / static throughout the policy's previous So why now does it come another 1km closer to Great Barton There is no protections for Cattishall as CS1 etc positively assure us that town will not eat village.This is not the case HERE.	Prior to the identification of this site, there were two site submitted to the council for consideration, SS48 and WS65. Neither site was being proposed by the council. SS48 was smaller than that now proposed, but WS65 was significantly larger. The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters, including protecting the identity of Cattishall are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 8: North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 8b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21727E	Tim Harbord	West Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust	Tim Harbord Associates				
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	The boundaries of the other development areas include any proposed buffer zones to preserve neighbouring villages whereas this one does not. The development area being situated entirely to the south of the A143 means that the hamlet of Cattishall is in danger of being swamped by new housing. Development entirely on one side of a major arterial road will create access / egress bottle-necks with all of the traffic flow onto and off the A143 being into the same area. Why has land to the north and west of the A143, adjacent to the south side of Barton Stud, been discounted from potential development? The proposed development area contains no requirement for improved road infrastructure in the immediate vicinity, unlike all of the other development areas, despite their being known (and deteriorating) traffic bottlenecks in or adjacent to the area - Ortwell Road Rail bridge, central Great Barton, Bunbury Arms crossroads.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Buffer requires robustness to remove easterly development progression and avoid better protection of Cattishall. The developer needs to establish the history of the area, consult and plant accordingly with the local community involved and signed off	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no	Reduce size to what road system can cope with. Reduce number of units to allow open space linking existing Abbey Gardens and 'leg of mutton' field along river Lark to Nowton Park via a new riverside open space and footpath.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. The riverside walk is included in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	No, for the same reason as above, that it is permitting an extension of the suburbs around the town.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	This development will cause gridlock at the 'Sainsbury' A14 interchange. There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered 1 There should be a link road from this development to junction 44 on A14 2 The current proposed link from Rougham Road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be an independent relief road not a speed restricted high street.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15800	Davis & Kay Thompson			no	As two people in our 60s we feel the quality of life we experience in our bungalow we will be very much compromised by the development alongside Sicklesmere Road for the following reasons. We purchased this bungalow 5 years ago, seeking to move nearer the town from a village. One of its main draws was the superb view across open country, and due to its tucked away situation, a feeling of quiet and security. If these plans go ahead we will lose our view, experience additional noise from new local car and people movement and face more anxiety regarding security. The proposed road branching from the A134 to take traffic towards the A14, for us will be another busy road (at '700 cars per hour at peak times') cutting right across our line of vision, adding to the already existing noise of the A134. At peak times the Rougham Road roundabout is at a standstill with vehicles coming into Bury, so we cannot see how moving more cars across to that junction will ease traffic problems.	Unfortunately, development inevitably brings change, which can impact on existing properties to a greater or lesser extent. In planning terms, there is no right to a view, but it is important that outlook is protected and that existing properties do not suffer undue overlooking or overshadowing. The proposed relief road has the potential to remove a significant proportion of the traffic currently using Sicklesmere Road. If this relief road does run through the development in the form of a high street, traffic speeds will be low through a built up area and traffic noise should not be an issue for Sicklesmere Road residents. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. Whatever road is ultimately provided will need to address the challenges faced and will be part of a comprehensive town wide solution. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Davis & Kay Thompson				<p>Added to which, we fear the possibility of a school 'rat run' to the envisaged primary school. A new busy high street, possible school crossing patrol plus 10-15 mph speed limit will all impede vehicle flow. On the subject of bike and foot paths, certainly commendable ideas, we do bike into the town centre but seem to be a minority.</p> <p>Our final point is of house buying and selling. If we decided to sell tomorrow, we feel these proposed plans will immediately compromise our ability to sell as prospective buyers would learn of current plans for development in our adjacent field. Our bungalows main appeal is its view and seclusion. All living rooms, bedroom and kitchen face the view. Nobody along Sicklesmere Road has quite this aspect to lose. We feel our house equity will be compromised. Will there be any compensation for this? As time scale between initial plans and start of building is unknown, uncertainty is an added dilemma for us.</p>		
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	<p>The following comments draw on the document produced by the developers of the proposed site (see www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/sebc/live/pdf/Planning/Vision2031/BuryStEdmundsSouthEastConceptStatement.pdf) and referred to below as the Concept Statement. The greenfield sites involved present a wide range of severe challenges that make the suitability of the overall site for housing development on the scale envisaged highly contentious. These matters are discussed individually below.</p> <p>A134 Relief Road: SEBC's Policy CS 11(v) states that long-term strategic growth to the south east of Bury should contribute to reducing congestion at appropriate junctions on the A14 in Bury St Edmunds and deliver a relief road that reduces levels of through traffic using the A134 Rougham Road and Sicklesmere Road. It is notable that neither of these desiderata are quantified but to have any worthwhile effect the reductions would presumably have to be by at least 25% of current levels.</p>	This policy relates to the boundaries proposed for the strategic growth area to the south east of Bury St Edmunds and not the draft masterplan produced by the Prince's Trust. However, the concept statement contained in the appendix to the vision 2031 document does set out the parameters for the development of this land, which will be developed further by the masterplan process. The masterplan will need to address the issues raised, particularly with regard to the nature and form of the relief road and the need for other highway improvements. Just because a road is suggested in a form which does not conform to what has been provided before, does not mean that it should be disregarded.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Junction 44 of the A14 is recognised as being already highly congested at peak times (document D1-SEBC-03 of the Core Document Library). The problems arise, at least to the southern side of the A14, from traffic at the Southgate and Rougham Road roundabouts. In the design concept shown in the Concept Statement, a proposed A134 relief road is shown, extending from a new roundabout junction on the existing A134 and by a tortuous path through the middle of the proposed development to terminate at the Rougham Road roundabout. It would be obvious to anyone with regular experience of the traffic at the present congested roundabouts that simply diverting the A134 traffic from the Southgate roundabout some 400 metres to the Rougham Road roundabout could do nothing to alleviate the congestion, and would in fact be likely to worsen tailbacks onto the A14 itself because the main source of congestion would be moved closer to Junction 44. That would certainly be the case under present traffic loads and will only be exacerbated by new traffic from 1250 additional housing units.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				The proposal to put a relief road through the middle of a housing estate is so fatuous as barely to deserve comment. It could only be safely done with wide margins and deliberate establishment of buffer zones between housing areas and the roadway, for example as at Bedingfield Way and Orttewell Road on the Moreton Hall estate. The proposal to have the road, which would inevitably bear substantial HGV traffic, winding through the middle of an estate with a deliberate intention to reduce traffic speeds is an affront to anyone who might live near such a road and undoubtedly a recipe for pedestrian deaths, not least for children as the Concept Statement shows the road passing directly beside the putative primary school. Furthermore, a road with regular heavy traffic passing through the middle of a housing estate would inevitably restrict contact between the two sides of the community.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				The Concept Statement, despite acknowledging that policy CS11 requires a relief road, attempts to worm around these inconvenient facts by stating (page 24) that the 'new strategic link' '...is not designed as a by-pass but will function as a limited diversionary route'. These weasel words, attempting to divert notice of the failure of the proposal to deliver a core objective of Policy CS11, must be recognised for their true impact. Furthermore, whatever gloss might be put upon the road, its routing directly contravenes a promise made by spokesmen for the developers that the integrity of Rushbrooke Lane would be preserved.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Such a 'cheap and nasty' relief road is simply not an acceptable option, but the solution is already evident from the council's commitment to construction of an Eastern relief road from the Moreton Hall estate to Junction 45 of the A14. A similar plan can be readily envisaged for the south side of Bury, i.e. a link from the A134 to Junction 45. This could be achieved without incursion upon the Special Landscape Area (see below) and has far more potential to remove much of the through traffic on the A134 from the congested roads on the southern side of Bury. It might, in the longer term, form the first section of a southern relief road linked ultimately to Junction 42 that could, inter alia, provide access to the proposed Health Campus on the western side of the town. A southern relief road has been considered for many years but never acted upon. We understand that the proposed eastern relief road will require major redesign of Junction 45 and therefore presents an ideal opportunity at least to start on a southern relief road.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				What must be recognised is that any solution to the A134 relief road problem will endure for many years, and it will be far better to build a properly thought out road that has potential for future extension rather than one which is unsustainable and can never meet the requirements of Policy CS11. There will be an inevitable response from developers that the good solution will be too expensive, but the answer to that must be that, without appropriate and decent quality infrastructure, building more houses is not acceptable. This is exactly the position that the Council has taken with respect to the eastern relief road and Moreton Hall, and there seems no reason why the same consideration should apply in south-east Bury.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Special Landscape Area and the Natural Environment: A Special Landscape Area (SLA) is present towards the south-eastern end of the site and extends in a broad swathe from the A134 to within approximately 150 metres of the A14. In fact, this land is a small part of the much SLA which stretches right across the southern perimeter of Bury St Edmunds (see map on page 21 of the SEBC Core Strategy). Section 4.28 of the Core Strategy states an intention to protect the SLA pending a detailed landscape assessment of the Borough. The wording of Section 8.14 of the Inspector's Report on the public examination of the Core Strategy reads in part: 'The LP defines and protects Special Landscape Areas, shown on the adopted Proposals Map. PPS7 indicates that such designations should only be maintained where it can be clearly shown that criteria-based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection.'	The inclusion of part of the area within a special Landscape Area does not necessarily prevent that part of the site coming forward for development. It is essential that a landscape assessment considers the merits of all parts of the site in a comprehensive and cohesive manner.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>The CS indicates that, while some landscape character assessment work has been undertaken in partnership with Suffolk County Council and other St Edmundsbury Borough Council Core Strategy DPD Inspector's Report 2010 districts, this is insufficiently detailed to form the basis for the replacement of the designation at this stage. I am satisfied that the ongoing joint work needs to be completed before the designation could be deleted.'</p> <p>We would interpret this to say that changes to the SLA must be kept on hold until on-going studies by Suffolk County Council and SEBC have reached a conclusion: certainly it is oxymoronic to suggest that an area considered to have special landscape value could retain that quality if covered by urban sprawl. Furthermore, a major breach of the SLA's integrity will set an important precedent, likely to be used in future planning appeals by developers that would probably be impossible to resist.</p>		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>However, the status of the SLA and PPS7 has been thrown into doubt by changes to national planning guidance, as embodied in the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Nevertheless, speaking in an interview on the BBC 'Countryfile' programme on 8th January 2012, the Prime Minister himself stated that changes to planning law, by which he appeared to mean the recently enacted Localism bill, have opened the way for local communities to designate areas of countryside which they wish to protect. After years of inertia at County and Borough levels on updating protection of the SLA, this is a clear opportunity to use new legislation to protect the huge swathe of countryside that fringes the southern margin of Bury St Edmunds. We must not miss this opportunity to thwart the developers' charter that is implicit in the NPPF.</p>		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>The concept presented in the Draft Report proposes two substantial incursions onto the SLA, one on land opposite the Rushbrooke Kennels and Southgate Farm and the other onto land between the River Lark and the A134. The SLA and the agricultural fields immediately to the north east of it provide a green link with the areas closer to the town known as the Leg of Mutton (see further comment below) and No Man's Meadows, which have long been regarded by local planners as being vital to the historical setting of Bury St Edmunds. As well as the visual importance of those areas, No Man's Meadows has substantial wildlife interest that is of recreational benefit to residents of Bury. Urban development on the proposed site would further isolate the Leg of Mutton and No Man's Meadows, and it is widely accepted that small, isolated patches of land have their wild populations seriously damaged in comparison with the original contact with larger, undeveloped land areas.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>The government's White Paper 'The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature' published in 2011 includes the statement 'fragmentation of natural environments is driving continuing threats to biodiversity'.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the farmland and woodland within the SLA has a rich wildlife population. The arable fields to the front and rear of Southgate Farm support large numbers of hares (13 counted on a recent occasion) and deer regularly pass through the area, while skylarks can frequently be heard in the relevant seasons. Both the brown hare (<i>Lepus europaeus</i>) and skylark (<i>Alauda arvensis</i>) are priority species for conservation in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. There are also good numbers of numerous other bird species in the area. Without giving an exhaustive list, one can cite sparrowhawk, little owl, great spotted and green woodpeckers, lapwing and buzzard, reed bunting as well as more common species that include at least 4 species of tits and finches and 3 of thrushes.</p>		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>The ranges of many of these species are likely to overlap with No Man's Meadows and the Leg of Mutton.</p> <p>Given the Council's intention expressed in the Core Strategy to retain the SLA, it appears out of the question to propose an urban development that makes substantial incursions upon it. I note that advice received in emails from SEBC makes the point that the SLA has never been a bar to development, but there is a world of difference between a small number of isolated houses and occasional villages scattered across the large area as at present, and an urban sprawl of dense housing. The latter cannot in any rational interpretation be consistent with the present wildlife and amenity value of the landscape.</p>		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>Electricity Pylons: The 132 kV electricity supply to Bury St Edmunds runs on pylons across much of proposed development site. Although it remains a matter of debate, there is significant and continued public disquiet about living underneath HT transmission lines, specifically in relation to an increase in the risk for childhood leukaemia. The authoritative US National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences continues to accept that there is a weak link between the electromagnetic field generated by HT lines and the incidence of childhood leukaemia (see http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/emf/ and related links there from).</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				While the situation undoubtedly remains controversial, the precautionary principle suggests that building houses and schools within 60-100 metres of HT transmission lines should be avoided. Options on the present site would therefore be to leave undeveloped a buffer zone of ~150 metres width underneath the HT line or to underground at least the length of the line that crosses the proposed development site. Both options have substantial cost implications but there can be no point in building houses that have very limited market appeal. If any proposal for undergrounding of the cables is considered, it should be explicitly clear that the full costs of that work are borne by developers and in no way, including any manner of cost offsetting of other payments, allowed to become a charge upon the Council's taxpayers.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				In terms of sustainable future planning, it might in any case be considered prudent to retain the present undeveloped status of the land, since it provides the only obvious corridor of access for possible future upgrading of HT transmission to the existing electricity substation for Bury. Flooding: Much of the area under consideration is part of the River Lark flood plain. In three of the four winters in 2008-2012 when one of us (JC) has lived at Southgate Farm (and no doubt long before) there has been flooding of the land beside the river on the side opposite the rear of this property. This area corresponds to that shown as playing fields in the Concept Statement (page 20). The Concept Statement (page 23) shows five drainage swales (corresponding to surface water drainage from approximately two-thirds of the proposed development) leading directly into the area where flooding always occurs in normal winters.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				This is an obvious 'design for guaranteed disaster' and alone should be grounds for condemnation of this deeply flawed proposal. In any case, the local record for drainage is poor - a scheme to alleviate flooding in Rushbrooke Lane was installed several years ago, with drains running below ground at the property known as Rushbrooke Kennels. From conversations with the owner, it is evident that the system has never been maintained and Rushbrooke Lane continues to flood whenever there is moderate or heavier rainfall. The drainage system proposed in the Concept Statement will require maintenance long after the developers have gone, but the record suggests that money will not be allocated to such maintenance.		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Nationally there have been numerous examples of inappropriate development on flood plains, with consequent huge personal disruption and economic costs. It seems fairly evident that major hydraulic engineering of the River Lark and associated floodplain, probably extending well downstream, would be required to ensure immunity of existing and putative future houses from an unacceptable risk of flooding. Simply repeating the errors of developments elsewhere that have subsequently suffered flooding cannot be an acceptable option.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Education: Using the commonly adopted formula that 1000 homes produce an average of 30 children per year group, 1250 homes equates to an average 37.5 children per year group. Obviously this number exceeds the capacity of a 1-form entry primary school (limited to 30 pupils per class up to Key Stage 1) but is far below what could be considered sustainable for a 2-form entry school. It is important to recognise that a local primary school is probably the most socially-cohesive influence in any neighbourhood, for reasons that any parent will recognise, but this very socio-beneficial influence would be greatly diminished if there were a continual battle for admission to the facility.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				The proposed development site is very constrained by the existing heavily-trafficked road layout and it is inconceivable that children unable to gain entry to a new primary school on the site could be expected to walk on these very busy roads to existing schools elsewhere in Bury, even if those schools had the capacity to absorb the surplus numbers. The consequences would be both a continual source of community tension as parents compete for limited places and an inevitable increment in traffic volume to transport children out of the area. Neither effect sits well with sustainability criteria. Conversely, a sustainable 2-form entry school would need to draw on pupils from outside the proposed development, with an inevitable increase in car journeys to drop off and collect children.		
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Leisure: An aim of the Core Strategy is to enhance leisure opportunities from the proposed development. However, its construction would eliminate some existing leisure activities. For example, the golf driving range in Rushbrooke Lane would disappear. Furthermore, there is regular traffic of leisure walkers and cyclists along the lane as people avail themselves of the rural atmosphere close to the town. Lastly, a significant amount of shooting takes place during the game season on the land areas proposed for development, and would obviously have to cease. Since the putative playing fields would be under water for several weeks in most winters, their value will also be limited. Thus there is a significant trade-off between existing leisure activities and those that might arise as a consequence of development.		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	This development will cause gridlock at the Bury East A14 interchange. There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered 1 There should be a link road from this development to the improved Rookery junction on A14. 2 The current proposed link road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road not a speed restricted high street. i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	We suggest plans include a park & ride facility off Rougham Road.	Should such a facility be required this is one of any number of sites which could be considered.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	This development will cause gridlock at the Bury East A14 interchange. There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered 1 There should be a link road from this development to the improved Rookery junction on A14. 2 The current proposed link road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road not a speed restricted high street. i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Map should show proposed relief road bypassing residential areas; there should be green/open space.	This policy relates to the boundaries proposed for the strategic growth area to the south east of Bury St Edmunds and not any details therein. These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Need to consider properly impact on the environment.	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Major infrastructure required to handle traffic.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>Question 9 - POLICY BV6: Strategic Sites - South East Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Whilst we have no concerns in relation to the boundaries of this development site, we would recommend that the site should be subject to a sequential test approach, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Technical Guidance. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate).</p> <p>A site specific Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance (section 9) would need to be undertaken to properly assess the implications of flood risk and would also inform the decision-making process. This requirement has been communicated to the promoter of the site through the community masterplanning events that were held last year.</p>	It is known that the overall area includes areas located with flood zones 1, 2 and 3. It is not intended that development should take place in any areas other than zone 1, but nevertheless, should sequential testing will be required if anything is proposed which affects zones 2 or 3. This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Major infrastructure required to cope with traffic.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15954	Dawn Parnell			no	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too many houses (traffic already heavy between Southgate Green & lorry park). 2. Housing too near to R.Lark & liable to flood or cause flooding to the other side of the R.Lark. 3. A lovely hillside view lost forever. 4. Light pollution. 5. Noise pollution. 6. Building on arable land. 	Most of these issues are identified in the concept statement for the area and will need to be addressed by the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>This development will cause gridlock at the Bury East A14 interchange.</p> <p>There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There should be a link road from this development to the improved Rookery junction on A14. 2 The current proposed link road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road not a speed restricted high street. i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities. 	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	This seems to be an exceptionally large development with no major roads on the boundary - congestion is already terrible.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	No segregation between town and the village of Rushbrooke.	The proposed urban extension does not impact upon the village of Rushbrooke.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree if it includes engineering works to Rougham Road to facilitate the CLB	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	No segregation between town and the village of Rushbrooke.	The proposed urban extension does not impact upon the village of Rushbrooke.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	There needs to be a thorough assessment of the infrastructure requirements to this development and how this will alleviate current issues in the area before the added dimensions of additional 1250 dwellings from this proposal.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Yet more development to the east of Bury, an area that cannot cope with existing levels of development. The A14 Eastern interchange will not cope and to create a so-called high street at the proposed development will have no mitigating effect on through traffic.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		We were pleased to note the grant of planning permission in 2011 for the strategic development of land east of the A14 which itself adjoins Nowton Park. It can be seen from the plans therefore that the proposal will lead to a town boundary abutting Nowton Park and the A14 some 80% along the south-eastern boundary of Nowton Park. Whilst fully supporting this strategic release it does bring into question why Nowton Park, being a substantial urban park for the inhabitants of Bury St. Edmunds, is now to be included or to be included within the town boundary because of its substantial benefits to the urban population. There is no planning logic to Nowton Park's inclusion within the 'rural area' as it has no rural role of any significance but does have substantial roles in supporting the population of Bury St. Edmunds in its southern sector. That is why we will petition for a change in the town boundary to include Nowton Park and in particular Nowton Court which sits in and adjoining that urban park.	Nowton Park is deliberately located outside of the Housing Settlement Boundary as it is an important recreational parkland which should be protected from development.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You are not keeping 'green' land between development/town and villages. Link road 'a joke!' Sicklesmere Road already congested - another road to join it is madness!	The nearest village to the east of Bury St Edmunds is Rushbrooke. There is a significant green area between the proposed urban extension and Rushbrooke.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Chery Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Due to gridlock at A14 interchange (Bury East).	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I do not agree with the expansion as shown. A significant challenge is NOT to alter the character of the town as it is presently. The suggested changes certainly will do that to the detriment of the town. Such housing growth as suggested should be restricted and/or achieved by the planning of a new village, not extensions of the town.	The option of a new settlement as an alternative, was considered early in the preparation of the Core Strategy and dismissed.	No changes required
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust			This site is located adjacent to the River Lark. Any development should be suitably designed so as to ensure that there is no adverse effect on the river, this should include an appropriate natural green space buffer between any development and the river.	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not object to the development boundary of this site, but we would advise that this option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that the proposal could result in the creation of significant highway issues with the new development being used as a shortcut for through traffic from the A14 to the A134. Rushbrook Lane would effectively perform as a relief road for traffic heading between the A14 and Sudbury. The Society fails to appreciate how development of this scale within this area (designated as a SLA) can serve to protect the local environment. Indeed, it would appear logically to represent a significant threat to the quality of the local environment running directly contrary to the reasons for inclusion in the original designation.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. A relief road will be required as part of the development. The form of this road will be developed through the masterplan process, but will not use Rushbrooke Lane.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, would remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes. Special Landscape Area. Under no circumstances should the special landscape area be developed or compromised in any way. If such landscapes are needed to satisfy the expansion plans, then this can only indicate that the town has reached a natural maximum size and should be developed no further.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. The inclusion of part of the area within a special Landscape Area does not necessarily prevent that part of the site coming forward for development. It is essential that a landscape assessment considers the merits of all parts of the site in a comprehensive and cohesive manner.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Infrastructure problems and is too near Rushbrooke and Sicklesmere. The ribbon development on Sicklesmere Road was bad enough. The river Lark floods and in any event, the valley should be protected.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This large plot includes valuable crop land, which we need for production of food, fuel and materials. It will interfere with railway route which may well need to be re-installed in the future. Development should not be allowed in this beautiful landscape, and not next to the River Lark.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Must not enlarge on existing development boundaries i.e. NO new developments on fields/green areas	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 9: South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the south-east Bury St Edmunds site identified on the Proposals Map?	Question 9b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Less valuable farmland should be used for development	There is no less valuable farmland around Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	Again, is the size of this site necessary? Surely BSE does not have to supply all these new homes .Other towns could share some of the burden.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of Bury St Edmunds, not any other town.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	This will increase the gridlock at Bury East interchange and again there needs to be major infrastructure changes before this development is considered. A link road to an improved Rookery junction would be desirable as well	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21578E	Gregory Gray Associates		The Garden Centre Group	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	This development will cause gridlock at the Bury East A14 interchange. There needs to be major infrastructure improvements in place before this development is considered: 1. There should be a link road from this development to the improved Rookery junction on A14. 2. The current proposed link road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road not a speed restricted high street. i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The current catchment middle school for the Moreton Hall is Hardwick Middle. It is too far for the children to walk, the school bus is very expensive and the roads are blocked and very slow in the morning. The additional houses will cause even more pressure at the A14 Sainsbury's roundabout and Rougham Road. The current proposed link road to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road not a speed restricted high street.	The future of three tier education is currently the subject of review in Bury St Edmunds. The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no	<p>The inclusion of a night club in the proposal would make residential living horrible. As it stands, residents at Forum Court are disturbed by shouting, car horn and conduct likely to cause a breach of the peace at 11:30 pm when the pubs clear, 2 - 2:30am when people make their way to the night club from other late night venues which do not enjoy the same favour with their licences. And are then subjected to more noise at 4am which continues sometimes until 5:30am since drunks are encouraged to hang around by fast food outlets being allowed to stay open and Tesco's 24 hour superstore just across the road.</p> <p>It is HORRIBLE to live here and most residents do not stay long. The council is unhelpful with concerns raised and would not allow me to object to the licence when the club opened in December 2011 after having closed down.</p>	no opinion		The development of the masterplan will consider compatible uses on the site.	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper					no	This option should be subject to pre-determination assessment and appraisal of standing buildings to allow for preservation in situ of any significant built heritage assets. Below-ground archaeology can be dealt with by condition.	These issues will be dealt with at the time of any application for development	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no	This area has been an eyesore for many years, and I see little positive effort to resolve the underlying issues. Clearly it is not a straightforward area to develop. The fact that it is more challenging should not mean the development is put on the back burner again. I do agree it should be mixed use as proposed, but I disagree about is it has been largely ignored because of the degree of difficulty	no opinion		Development cannot take place on the site until the rail sidings have been relocated.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	Yes, it is usually a good idea to develop brownfield sites, especially when they are as unsightly as this one, but please try to ensure that any new development here is of a higher architectural standard than the recent development close to the station, which is of very poor quality and is out of scale with the area.	yes		A masterplan will be produced prior to the approval of a planning application which will establish the design requirements.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	We consider Station Hill site has to be looked at jointly with Tayfen Road site			Whilst one concept plan for the two areas was produced the two sites will have different future uses which requires them to be dealt with as separate sites	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	Unfortunately little to nothing will ever happen as Network rail is a major stakeholder in this area. Even with (compulsory purchase powers) With Network rail & with the growth of freight trains (ongoing) because of Felixstowe docks expansion.	no opinion		Development cannot take place on the site until the rail sidings have been relocated.	No changes required
BVR15909	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes		no	The Station Hill site has been allocated for several years in successive development plans including the previous two incarnations of the St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan. The unduly protracted Concept Statement adoption and Masterplan preparation process led to delays which carried the proposal into the property recession in 2008. Since that time Hopkins Homes Ltd has been periodically reviewing the proposals but they remain unviable when balanced against the costs of the site remediation and sidings relocation works. Clearly the policy stance here should be revised to acknowledge the viability issues and to try to stimulate a planning circumstance which will stimulate regeneration. We believe that the policy which is largely the same as the Local Plan Policy should be updated to reflect the change in circumstances. Furthermore, the Concept Statement for the site is no longer an appropriate to guide the masterplan given the passage of time since its inception and its relationship with superseded policy. As a minimum the policy should be revised as follows:	no	The site bounded by Out Northgate, Tayfen Road and the Ipswich - Cambridge railway line is suitable for mixed development and is allocated primarily for medium to high density residential development and may also include: a) offices and other B1 employment; b) leisure uses; c) retail uses to serve local needs; d) ancillary car and cycle parking; e) bus infrastructure; and Page 2 of 2 f) strategic landscaping. The amount of land available for development; location, extent, and mix of uses; access and parking arrangements; and layout and landscaping will be informed by a masterplan for the site.	The Council wishes to see the comprehensive redevelopment of the site which may not occur if small parcels of the site are allowed to come forward prior to the relocation of the rail sidings.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes					<p>The site may be developed in phases on the basis that each phase does not prohibit the subsequent phases of the site from being redeveloped in accord with the masterplan. Planning permission will not be granted for redevelopment which could not coexist with the continued active operation of the sidings which would be proposed for relocation in the longer term. Planning applications will be viability tested to assess the impact of planning policy requirements relating to planning gain and affordable housing allowing reduced requirements to reflect the costs and economic viability of delivering the masterplan.' The attached plan indicates the extent of initial phases of the development at the road frontage and provides an accurate site area to reflect site ownership and past policy consultations.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	There must be provision for future road/rail interchange eg drive on/drive off rail transporters for cars and container transfer to/from rail and lorry. This is a plan for the next 20 years when rail transport, especially freight, will become much more important. Amend e) to take account of significant expansion of car and cycle parking as commuters move from road to rail to get to their employment. The number of commuters is likely to rise significantly by 2031. See q 16 Add: i) facilities for access to sidings by road freight and vehicle transport by rail.	yes		The rail sidings require relocating to an alternative location prior to the redevelopment of the site. The policy already makes provision for parking associated with the station and a public transport interchange.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	The area has already been extensively re-developed. It is unclear why this area has been selected in particular. Does this indicate a pre-existing plan for further development which has not been disclosed?			A significant proportion of the site is underused or vacant. A concept plan for the redevelopment of Station Hill and Tayfen Road was adopted in 2007.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Brownfield sites developments sensible.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>Question 10 - POLICY BV8: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Section 5.15 identifies the land at Station Hill may be contaminated. We therefore support the statement that the land should be appropriately investigated. The site is located above a Source Protection Zone 1 so any contaminants that are mobilised as a result of redevelopment of the site could potentially impact a potable water resource. As the groundwater in the area is vulnerable to pollution an appropriate remediation strategy will be required. We would be happy to discuss this issue with any relevant parties.</p>			The comments are noted and the council will engage with the EA at the appropriate time.	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson				<p>This seems to be an ideal site for the development proposed. While there are clearly some issues with the railway sidings, their re-siting or proven lack of demand, this is a piece of land that will have great benefit for housing and some business, in that its central Bury location (relative to further afield) will help reduce traffic. It should be a priority for redevelopment despite the complexities, if necessarily by seeking support from our government representatives, and should not be an excuse for greenfield development elsewhere.</p>			This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the proposal to redevelop this strategic site in the Town Centre to support improvements to transport interchange.</p> <p>We believe that access to the station and its facilities should be improved in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.An integrated sustainable transport strategy. 2.Reducing congestion on the A14 and enhancing links to both Cambridge and Ipswich. <p>We submit that improvements to Station Hill should also be seen in the more immediate context given that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The impact of 300-400 new homes in this locality on the highway network with the Tayfen Road - Northgate Street area known to be congested at peak, rush hour times. 	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			2.There is potential to improve the Compiegne Way - Tayfen Road roundabout to improve rush hour flows and the performance of this junction in terms of facilitating onward access to the Station			Comments are noted	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Brown field sites preferable.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15942	Tom & Vicky Kingsnorth			yes	As a daily rail commuter between Bury St Edmunds and Ely, I have long felt it is a great pity that such an attractive building as the station is, the majority of the building is behind a high metal fence with boarded up windows. Shops, an off-shoot of the bi-weekly market, a cafe, seating, plant life, and other regenerative measures should be introduced into the immediate area. Having the rail station as a greater transport interchange would help too, as pedestrian traffic in the area would be much higher. A larger car park here would also keep cars away from the very central areas of the town. As for Station Hill, a change to the existing businesses is needed to improve the perception of this road. At present, there are solely nightclubs and take-away venues, whereas independent shops as found on the nearby St Johns St would still have great exposure from the greater footfall created by the above measures with passing pedestrian traffic.			This support is welcomed and the issues raised will be addressed through the development of a masterplan for the site.	No changes required
	Tom & Vicky Kingsnorth				The council should also lobby Greater Anglia to offer better incentives to those travelling to and from Bury St Edmunds by rail, as this benefits both Greater Anglia, in ticket revenue, and the council in terms of less vehicle traffic in the town centre.			Lobbying for improved rail services is an aspiration in the travel section of the document.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support the objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15956	Miss Caroline Pettitt			no	Deliveries by rail and associated storage will need room to expand in the future. This site should be reserved for that type of use, because it is inaccessible from the town centre.			A significant proportion of the site is underused or vacant and the needs of the rail station will be taken into account in the development of a masterplan for the site.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree but only when the Northgate Roundabout is remodelled. It's a bottleneck by design at present.			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	However, the development of suitable sidings must form part of the redevelopment Masterplan for Station Hill. Industrial accommodation is important to provide the economic/life balance to St Edmundsbury Borough. See Question 16 answer.	no opinion		The rail sidings require relocating to an alternative location prior to the redevelopment of the site.	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	While any additional parking is welcomed, to state that it will encourage the use of trains by those living in surrounding villages ignores the fact that easy access from the villages to the station will be prevented by congestion, particularly at peak commuting times. Having already built flats of poor design, it's too late to now refer to co-ordinated development for the area.			The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	Nationally we are trying to move freight from road-rail. Your policy flies in the face of that - keep the railway/freight use.	no	Redevelop the run down area along Station Hill/Tayfen Road before removing railway and associated activities.	The rail sidings require relocating to an alternative location prior to the redevelopment of the site.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		no	There should be a buffer of land, of reasonable size, between any housing and its nearness to the railway/A14.	This support is welcomed and the issues raised will be addressed through the development of a masterplan for the site.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Subject to transport assessment, the county council welcomes the proposal to regenerate this area, especially as part of an improved transport interchange, which we look forward to working with you to develop, as per LTP3. We further welcome the requirement that the mineral handling facilities must be protected. This option should be subject to pre-determination assessment and appraisal of standing buildings to allow for preservation in situ of any significant built heritage assets. Belowground archaeology can be dealt with by condition.			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society strongly supports the mixed use development of this site as a sequentially preferential site. The Society wishes to secure the redevelopment of PDL before greenfield silts are released.			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). No development should be considered on any Greenfield sites until all Brownfield sites are developed. Any development of Brownfield sites must be subject to the details of the master plans being agreed by local residents.	no opinion	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). No development should be considered on any Greenfield sites until all Brownfield sites are developed. Any development of Brownfield sites must be subject to the details of the master plans being agreed by local residents.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents.						The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Rail is a more sustainable mode of transport than road. Consideration has to be given to the long term future when this site may be a busy terminus for deliveries of goods and material by rail, over and above its current use for aggregates.	no	Boundary to south should not include the band of open space. This is an important green corridor, part of our green infrastructure. This should be left free of any development.	The development of the masterplan will consider compatible uses on the site and the site area.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Only build on existing built on areas...too small an area & not enough roadways/parking to expand/build new buildings	no opinion		The development of the masterplan will consider compatible uses on the site and the site area.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Care needs to be taken that the integrity of the existing bus station is not affected.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes	how would you control parking. Its a busy area and could become a real problem if not dealt with at planning stage.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	This area would benefit from a well designed development.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	This area is an eyesore and needs to developed as a priority.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	The area is scruffy and Brownfield sites should be developed first.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no	Some industrial units should be provided for existing businesses or help with relocating offered. Or compensation if businesses are forced to move by the council and developers. Traffic congestion is already bad on Station Hill/Tayfen Road and this will become much worse with the additional housing being planned. Especially if Station Hill becomes a one way system for public transport.	yes		The development of the masterplan will consider compatible uses on the site.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 10: Station Hill Development Area, Bury St Edmunds (BV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Station Hill area?	Question 10b - If not, what would you change?	Question 10c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 10d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes	However I feel it should be used for housing not as per 5.15. I agree with a) residential and office b) but no other.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	No requirement for retail with a substantial superstore in the area and a 10 minute walk to the existing town centre. Little or no requirement for leisure facilities given the facilities available close in central BSE. Priority should be housing and / or small business use.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			yes	I would incorporate the re-development of the existing building on this site.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	subject to proper consultation with train users etc	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				no	No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. In a previous comment relating to the development of the Masterplan for this area (Feb 2008), we suggested that an attempt should be made -to reinstate a readable northern boundary to the old town by way of landscaping and land use on the Tayfen Road corridor.	The comments are noted. The issues raised will be considered at the masterplan stage.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no	This area has been an eyesore for many years, and I see little positive effort to resolve the underlying issues. Clearly it is not a straightforward area to develop. The fact that it is more challenging should not mean the development is put on the back burner again. I do agree it should be mixed use as proposed, but I disagree about is it has been largely ignored because of the degree of difficulty			The council is committed to the redevelopment of this site but the gas holder will require decommissioning prior to any redevelopment taking place.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	We consider Station Hill site has to be looked at jointly with Tayfen Road site			Whilst one concept plan for the two areas was produced the two sites will have different future uses which requires them to be dealt with as separate sites	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	Did not actually tick any response but commented: * Is this the right place for a Supermarket/Retail Warehousing. The Traffic congestion of Tayfen Road is already bad. * How will a high volume supermarket cope with the Lorries and constant customers buying food. There is limit how far people will walk with bags of food shopping.			The allocation of the site for mixed use development will meet the wider needs of the area, reduce dependence on the private car and be more sustainable.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	<p>See answer as above.</p> <p>This re-opens the issue of the planning of supermarkets when St Edmundsbury officers sought to block the development of an ASDA supermarket on the Howard Estate in 2009. One issue was that a proposal had already been made to develop another supermarket in the Tayfen Road area. This issue needs to be re-investigated.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a risk of flooding in this area. The clue is in the name 'fen'.</p> <p>Council ought to avoid development on flood plains to prevent a recurrence of the flooding of that occurred with the Bell Meadow development in 1969</p>	no	A full geological survey and environmental impact assessment should have been undertaken before trying to fix any site boundary	There is the potential for foodstore to be accommodated on the Tayfen site where this use cannot be accommodated in the town centre. Flooding issues are considered in the adopted masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>Question 11- POLICY BV9: Tayfen Road, Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Section 5.17 identifies that the site may potentially be contaminated due to its previous land use as a gas holder and National Grid depot. Therefore, the land should be appropriately investigated, if contamination is identified suitable remedial measures must be undertaken. The site is also located above a Source Protection Zone 1 so any contaminants that are mobilised as a result of redevelopment of the site could potentially impact a potable water resource.</p>			The comments are noted and the Council will work with the EA to ensure all requirements are met.	No changes required
	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>As the groundwater in the area is vulnerable to pollution an appropriate remediation strategy will be required. We would be happy to discuss this issue with any relevant parties. The site lies within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) on our flood maps. There has been no consideration to Flood Risk on site. A sequential approach should be taken to direct development away from sensitive areas of flood risk, as set out in the NPPF. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment would need to be undertaken to properly assess the implications of flood risk and inform the decision-making process.</p>			See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	For the reasons expressed for BV8 and Question 10, this seems to be an ideal site.			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support the objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15956	Miss Caroline Pettitt			no	The existing business properties should be left intact to continue trading, because they provide a useful service close to the town centre.	no	The boundary should not include the existing business properties.	Much of the allocated area is vacant and most of the existing occupiers have intentions to relocate.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion	This area is a bit of any eyesore currently and would benefit from priority development	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree but get on with it and stop washing your hands of the Tayfen Master plan			This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no	<p>Policy BV9 allocates land at Tayfen Road for development including retail warehousing and a foodstore. Neither the policy nor supporting text specifies the size of the foodstore. The adopted Masterplan (2009) for the site does however make specific reference to a discount foodstore of 1,548 sq.m gross.</p> <p>The Council's retail evidence base (St Edmundsbury Retail Appraisal - Drivers Jonas Deloitte, January 2012) identifies only limited need for additional convenience goods floorspace in Bury St Edmunds of 475 sq.m net in 2021 (taking account of a discount foodstore of 1,548 sq.m gross at Tayfen Road as a commitment).</p>			We acknowledge the likely convenience goods need on this site and will make reference to this in the supporting text which accompanies the policy. To make reference in the policy could mean the policy is unresponsive to changing market conditions.	Reference made in supporting text to expected level of convenience goods provision on Tayfen Road site.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd		<p>It is expected that the remaining need for the convenience goods floorspace (i.e. 475 sq.m net up to 2021) will be met through small scale provision in the Strategic Growth Areas. Longer term predictions to 2031 are less reliable and will need to be reviewed at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>To accord with the evidence base and Masterplan, the allocation of a foodstore at Tayfen Road should therefore be restricted to a discount foodstore of 1,548sq.m gross. Policy BV9 should be amended to include such a floorspace cap.</p>			See above	See
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Bulky goods retail will not be an attraction to a difficult to reach site; Suffolk Business Park provides a less difficult option for shoppers. Again access will be an issue and the 'enhanced public traffic corridor' will no doubt consist solely of a bike track and bus stop. Unfortunately, not too many bulky goods can be carried on buses and bikes.</p>			The changing nature of the retail warehouse market means it would be inappropriate to pre-judge the types of goods to be sold at this stage in the process.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	But think about extra traffic and road's capability to carry it - will need to widen/build new road.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	Excess traffic congestion on main/local roads.	no opinion		The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion	Make the area only available to heavy lorries at specific times of the day to avoid too much congestion.	no opinion		The resolution of traffic congestion needs to be addressed holistically and be responsive to changing demands.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has no objection in principle to development at this location, subject to transport assessment, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. In a previous comment relating to the development of the Masterplan for this area (Feb 2008), we suggested that an attempt should be made 'to reinstate a readable northern boundary to the old town by way of landscaping and land use on the Tayfen Road corridor'.			The comments are noted. The issues raised will be considered at the masterplan stage.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society strongly supports the mixed use development of this site as a sequentially preferential site. The Society wishes to secure the redevelopment of PDL before greenfield sites are released.			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16020	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	Frontier Key Fund		In terms of the site boundary, the identified area outlines the development area from the adopted Masterplan. It should be noted that changes that the Masterplan (as described above) might affect the detailed definition of the development area, specifically in relation to its northern boundary, but otherwise the plan accurately reflects the area, which is likely to be redeveloped under revised proposals.			Comments are noted	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	The boundaries of the site. It is too extensive (see below).	no	Boundary should be kept south of the waterway and far enough from it to allow a natural green edge as part of an important green corridor. The 'Total' petrol station/shop should be left. Southern boundary should be back from the roads to allow for tree planting and cycle way.	Much of the allocated area is vacant and most of the existing occupiers have intentions to relocate.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support the objection	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Too ambitious too crowded & roads will not cope	no opinion		Developers will be expected to make improvements to the public transport corridor and links to the town centre	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor					no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	It would tidy up what is an untidy approach to the town.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	REMOVAL OF SUPERMARKET. IT WILL CAUSE TOTAL GRID LOCK WITH DELIVERY & CUSTOMERS FOR THE SUPERMARKET	no opinion		Developers will be expected to make improvements to the public transport corridor and links to the town centre	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	This area and the town would benefit from the type of development planned.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	Please dual carriage way Tayfen Road now while you have the chance!	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no					
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes	Supermarket in the town will lead to traffic problems with deliveries and customers 24 hours a day as it is sited on the main road into town centre.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I do not agree BV9 i -iii) inclusive. make it used for housing solely. Build flats, to accommodate the maximum number of social housing units possible. The people in them will be able to walk to talk (achieving your aspirations of non-car use). These people may not have cars of their own. Why put them on the far flung outskirts of the town (Moreton hall and Fornham All Saints eg) where they will be reliant on busses. Negotiating busses when one has a pram and kids in tow, plus shopping isn't practical.	yes		The allocation of the site for mixed use development will meet the wider needs of the area, reduce dependence on the private car and be more sustainable.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 11: Tayfen Road Bury St Edmunds (BV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with the proposal to redevelop the Tayfen Road area?	Question 11b - If not, what would you change?	Question 11c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 11d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21751E	Scott Lewis	National Grid Property Limited	Planning Perspectives LLP	yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	Site is very close to BSE and substantial retail choice within walking distance. Greater retail occupancy in BSE town centre should be promoted ahead of creating new spaces based on no known demand. Priority for this area should be residential.	no opinion		The allocation of the site for mixed use development will meet the wider needs of the area, reduce dependence on the private car and be more sustainable.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion	I would incorporate the re-development of the existing building on this site. I believe there is a nature reserve in this location, which should remain.	no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	BUT retail warehousing and a foodstore if large are in the wrong place. The pressure on the roads will be huge and the impact on neighbouring housing unacceptable. I favour housing and employment uses (offices etc not minimum part time work such as that offered by supermarkets	no opinion		The allocation of the site for mixed use development will meet the wider needs of the area, reduce dependence on the private car and be more sustainable.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15679	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association		no	<p>BV10(g) Almoners Barn Cullum Road</p> <p>You have asked for comments on the above proposal. I write as Secretary of the Lydgate Court Residents' Association, whose members will be most closely affected by the proposal, and the following comments reflect their views.</p> <p>Policy 1 of Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council Joint Development Management Policies Preferred Options Consultation Document (Creating Places - Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness) states that:</p> <p>Proposals for all development, (including changes of use, shop fronts, and the display of advertisements), should, as appropriate:</p>		See below	No changes required
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>h) not affect adversely:</p> <p>i. the distinctive historic character and architectural or archaeological value of the area and/or building;</p> <p>ii. the urban form, including significant street patterns, individual or groups of buildings and open spaces;</p> <p>iii. important landscape characteristics and prominent topographical features;</p> <p>iv. sites, habitats, species and features of ecological interest;</p> <p>v. the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, other pollution (including light pollution), or volume or type of vehicular activity generated;</p> <p>vi. and / or residential amenity.</p>		See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>i) produce designs and layouts which are safe and take account of crime prevention, community safety and public health;</p> <p>j) produce designs that provide access for all, and that encourage the use of sustainable forms of transport through the provision of pedestrian and cycle links, including access to shops and community facilities; and</p> <p>k) produce designs, in accordance with standards, that maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network;</p> <p>Our Residents have several main concerns about the proposals:</p>		See below	No changes required
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>Access to the proposed site</p> <p>We understand based on previous advice that the Borough Council would be reluctant to allow access directly from the proposed site onto Cullum Road. Consequently, the only other access at present is by a narrow entrance at the Cullum Road end of Laundry Lane, which is adjacent to our East Car Park. Building an access road there at this site would threaten the safety of the highway network (sections j & k). We are already experiencing congestion at the northern end of Laundry Lane with cars belonging to employees from the SICON office block opposite Lydgate Court parking there. Delivery drivers and the Council's Refuse Collection vehicles already have difficulty at times manoeuvring around these parked cars to access our waste store in the East Car Park.</p>		See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			When Cullum Road is congested, some motorists drive across the pavement near the pedestrian crossing to avoid congestion at the roundabout ahead (this matter has already been raised with the County's Highways Department but no action to prevent this dangerous practice has been forthcoming yet). This practice is already extremely dangerous as the crossing is widely used by school children and other pedestrians. Providing access for vehicles from the occupants of 12 houses, some of whom might have more than one car, could cause a major problem, especially to the elderly residents exiting Lydgate Court on foot or driving into and out of the East car park.		See below	No changes required
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			The only access to the whole Abbots Gate housing development is via Laundry Lane and now that additional housing has been built, we have seen a large increase in the volume of traffic driving past Lydgate Court, some of the vehicles being driven at excessive speeds. Impact of any development on Lydgate Court Building 12 dwellings on this site may contravene section h(v). Depending on the type of housing built, residents are concerned that there could be a loss of natural light in those of our apartments that face onto the site as well as a loss of privacy caused by overlooking. Due to the close proximity of the proposed development, noise from the housing could also create a nuisance for our elderly residents.		See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>Safety of residents</p> <p>Lydgate Court has an ongoing problem with antisocial behaviour and vandalism from local youths using the Almoners Barn site which already intimidates a lot of the residents (this matter has been brought to the notice of the Suffolk Constabulary who have been active in dealing with the problem). However, Residents are concerned that additional housing may exacerbate this problem (section i)</p> <p>Loss of an open space</p> <p>Building on this site will lead to the loss of a valuable open space which forms a barrier between the existing development and Cullum Road. Residents enjoy the feeling of space around them and building on this site will make the existing development feel closed in and crowded.</p>		See below	No changes required
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>Summary</p> <p>The residents trust that these concerns will be taken into account when considering the suitability of this site for development. If the decision is made to allow development on this site, the residents ask that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safe access is provided to the site elsewhere and not from Laundry Lane. 2. Measures are put in place to reduce the speed of traffic driving onto the existing development. 3. Parking restrictions are put in place to ensure that pedestrians using the crossing and residents using the East car park can access the site safely. 4. Measures are put in place to stop cars crossing the pavement into Laundry Lane. 		The access to the site would be from the existing Laundry Lane access. Parking to serve the development will be in accordance with the adopted standards at the time of any application for development. Landscaping and design will be dealt with as part of any application for development on the site and will be in accordance with policies in the Local Plan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr J Kirk	Lydgate Court Residents' Association			<p>5. Ensure that there is sufficient parking near the properties to avoid more cars being forced to park in Laundry Lane.</p> <p>6. Ensure that the existing trees remain to provide a natural boundary between the two sites.</p> <p>7. Put measures in place to ensure that there is no further risk of antisocial behaviour and that there is no access from the new development into Lydgate Court.</p> <p>8. The design of any housing is sympathetic to the surrounding area, that it is not too high or intrusive in order to reduce the impact on nearby properties.</p> <p>Finally, whilst residents accept the need for Almoners Barn to be developed at some stage, they ask that due consideration is afforded to the above concerns when compiling the Vision 2031 document.</p>		See above	No changes required
BVR15683	Richard Ballam	Lydgate Court Residents' Association		no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15696	Enid Gathercole	St John Ambulance		no	We have a double garage at the front of our building plus a single garage - these are not shown on the development plan. Also we have car parking at the front and at the side of the building - these are also not shown on the development plan. We can have at least 12 cars when we have a training course - we need these spaces.	no opinion	The needs of St John Ambulance and other adjoining uses will be considered during the production of a development brief for the site. The requirement for a development brief has been added to the policy	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15711	Adrian Williams			no	<p>1. Retail is a key sector for employment generation. The supply of out of town centre retail space is limited and to create a sustainable economy it is essential to provide the greatest variety of employment types to include this sort of retail space/opportunity. Any loss of employment through the closure of the garden centre would be counter productive for our town.</p> <p>2. This site is an "edge of urban retail" and should therefore be considered as "safeguarded retail space" (as per the town centre retail policy).</p> <p>3. The river is a key habitat that should be protected at all costs.</p>		The garden centre site is privately owned and has been promoted to the council as a site available for development. The council has no control over whether the business will relocate to an alternative location. The site will eventually be surrounded by development once the south east strategic site is completed and within this context the site is suitable for development. The number of dwellings on the site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints. The design of the site will be determined at the planning application stage. The Lark Valley corridor is protected under existing policies in the Local Plan.	Number of dwellings reduced to 30
	Adrian Williams				<p>It is my submission therefore that, if any residential development were to be allowed, then it should be linked to the relocation of the Garden Centre to an equally appropriate site and that, as importantly, a ceiling should be placed upon development density. A reasonable solution would be to restrict the floor area of any new development to that currently provided by the garden centre. Finally, and crucially important, is that there should be on site green space such as the whole of the current car park of the garden centre.</p> <p>If these provisos were written in, in advance of planning permissions being examined, then we may see an outcome, which is acceptable to the local community and which is in the long term interests of our town</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15738	Phil Gladwell			no	<p>The redevelopment for housing of BVD10 (b & c) is very welcome from my perspective as the area is an eyesore.</p> <p>My concern is the traffic congestion on Petticoat Lane and Hospital Road early in the morning and ongoing from about 3.0pm until 5.45pm, partially due to the schools and parents parking on the roadside along with the very long queues leading down to the traffic lights at the Spread Eagle. It is obvious that BVD10(c) will exit right into this congestion, which is already unbearable and frustrating.</p> <p>I certainly hope that BVD (b) is only allowed to exit to the north and not down onto Hospital Road.</p> <p>I hope my comments are taken on board, frankly the congestion needs addressing regardless of any future development.</p>		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15767	Paul Manners			no	<p>This proposal would have considerable impact on us, as our house (5 Honey Hill) backs directly onto the Weymed site. Our rear boundary wall does in fact form part of the Northern boundary of this site and the rear wall of our house is only 5 metres from this same boundary wall.</p> <p>Approximately half our rear boundary backs onto the Records office building, while the remaining half backs onto an open part of the Weymed site currently used for car parking by Record Office staff and visitors.</p> <p>We have a single door in our rear wall, behind the Record Office, which has been in existence for hundreds of years and gives access to the Swan Lane Car Park and onto St Mary's Square.</p>		A development brief has been adopted for the Weymed and Shire Hall sites and any development on the Weymed site will need to be in accordance with this. The detailed comments made on the location of new development would need to be made in relation to any planning application for development on the site. Parking on the site will be in accordance with the adopted standards at that time.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Manners				<p>Another important fact is that the ground level of our house and rear courtyard is approx 1 metre lower than that of the Weymed site. This height difference will therefore exaggerate our problem of being overlooked by any building constructed on the site.</p> <p>We would therefore strongly object to any dwellings which have windows that overlook our rear wall, particularly bearing in mind that our main bedroom is situated at the rear of the house and has two large regency sash windows looking out onto the Weymed site.</p> <p>Furthermore, our main sitting room and conservatory are situated at the rear of the house and may well be overlooked by windows in the new development.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Paul Manners				<p>Our other major concern relates to the proposed development of the Weymed Site, the New Shire Hall and the Old Shire Hall site for a Travelodge type hotel. All these developments will inevitably have a huge impact on traffic and more importantly, parking. By developing the Weymed Site, you will not only eliminate the Swan Lane car park but also increase the demand for local parking. Even if the 14 dwellings are allocated a parking space each within the development, it will not be sufficient to accommodate 2 car families, guests, visitors, etc.</p> <p>The same situation will arise, but on a much greater scale, with the New Shire Hall development of 66 dwellings. A new hotel on the Old Shire Hall site will only exacerbate the situation still further by creating considerable parking demands for staff, guests and visitors.</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Manners				<p>Unfortunately no planners or architects ever allow sufficient space for parking. One only has to look at your new premises in Western Way, where after only a couple of years or so, it is now impossible for visitors to find a parking space on site! Or visit Bury Rugby Ground on any morning in the week to see the car park full of cars that belong to hospital staff, who have to be bussed to work!</p> <p>Currently we have a problem parking our car on a regular basis. We do not have a garage or off road parking and are therefore totally dependent on Residents Parking Permits. Unfortunately, for reasons that defy all logic, the restrictions that apply to residents parking bays are lifted after 6pm and all day Sundays. But we live here ALL day, ALL night EVERY day of the year! If we return home after 6pm, the chance of us finding a parking space is minimal.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Paul Manners				<p>If we take our dog for a walk early on a Sunday morning, we can never park in Honey Hill when we return because all spaces are taken by people attending services at St Mary's church or the cathedral. If they parked in Manor House car park they would have to pay - if they park in a Residents Bay, they do not! Can someone please explain to me the logic behind the reasoning that residents who have paid to park in a bay should have to forfeit that right to someone who has paid nothing, because it is a Sunday or after 6pm?!</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Manners				<p>Building 14 houses on Weymed, 66 houses on Shire Hall site and a hotel will make parking for existing residents impossible.</p> <p>please address the current situation now, nipping future problems in the bud by making residents bays what the name suggests - parking for residents only, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; and extend residents parking permits to include free parking in the new public car parks that MUST be created to accommodate the dramatic increase in demand that these new developments will surely create.</p>		See above	No changes required
BVR15769	Paul Farmer		Residents of Byfield Way	no	<p>We wish to object to the proposal contained in paragraph 5.21 and policy BV10 - the inclusion of the Bury Garden Centre site as brownfield land allocated for potential housing development with an indicative capacity of 52 homes.</p> <p>Vehicular traffic from these homes could easily amount to over 100 cars, in addition to our own, using the Vale Lane exit onto Rougham Road, which is already at full or even excess capacity at peak times. At present we struggle to turn left against the endless line of vehicles approaching. A large number of additional cars will inevitably mean long tailbacks in Vale Lane, leading to delays, driver frustration and potential dangerous mistakes.</p>		The traffic issues are recognised in para 5.21 and this will need to be addressed before development could proceed on the site	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Farmer		Residents of Byfield Way		<p>It is no coincidence that there have been accidents and near-misses where cars take the opportunity to pull out from Vale Lane quickly, but have to stop for a pedestrian on the adjacent crossing, whereupon cars behind in either road fail to stop in time.</p> <p>Due to the constraints of the existing road layout, the river and the police investigation centre, there is no alternative to vehicles using Vale Lane to exit the site, nor can there be in future. Any reduction of capacity provided by the proposed south-east relief road will not occur until nearer 2031, by which time capacity will have further increased and will also have to cater for 1250 new homes. Therefore the claim in 5.21 that "traffic constraints will need to be overcome" is futile; we do not believe they can be overcome.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Paul Farmer		Residents of Byfield Way		<p>Whilst the planning authority's parking standard of 1:1.5 might provide off-road parking for 78 cars, any more would have nowhere to park but Vale Land or Byfield Way. The former is already used to capacity on Sundays by visitors to the rugby club opposite, some of whom park in the garden centre car park. If the site were developed, Vale Lane would certainly be lined with cars on Sundays and during other rugby club events, possible on both sides, creating further difficulty of access/egress. We have no confidence that any new yellow lining would be enforced by the police.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Paul Farmer		Residents of Byfield Way		<p>Part of the site is on the flood plain, with Byfield Way already designated as a 'moderate' flood risk. A development as dense as that proposed would only exacerbate that risk for the new buildings as well as for us. Any flood attenuation provided for in the south-east development would again only benefit this site around 2031. In the shorter term only far fewer than 52 new homes, with the provision of well drained open green space, or fewer larger homes with bigger gardens, would help reduce this risk.</p>		The number of dwellings on the site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Number of dwellings reduced to 30

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Farmer		Residents of Byfield Way		In summary, we would prefer to see the site's continued use as a garden centre or similar retail outlet, using the existing planning consent and hours of operation. We firmly believe it should not be designated as a brownfield site for housing development. If our arguments above do not convince councillors of this, then we would ask that any designation for housing should indicate a very much lower density of units. We would also ask for a caveat that the site should not be developed any earlier than 2031, when the main south-east site is developed, in order to provide any benefits which are claimed to accrue from the larger infrastructure changes.		See above	Number of dwellings reduced to 30
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	<p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>(f) The northern part of this option lies within a Scheduled Monument (DSF 15998). Any development within this area will, therefore, require Scheduled Monument Consent. This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation and early discussions with English Heritage will be required to discuss the scope and feasibility of development within this area.</p> <p>In the southern part, no objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p>		Thank you for responding. This issue will be dealt with at the time any application for development on the site	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15781	Paul Farmer			no	<p>I wish to add the following brief comments on the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 draft document, currently out for consultation. I do so as one of the borough and town councillors for Abbeygate ward, to which my observations are confined.</p> <p>5.22 Although there are a number of access points for the land at Jacqueline Close, none of the existing ones is suitable for servicing the indicative number of houses (60). In particular that from Mill Road would only be suitable for pedestrians, due to its extreme narrowness. A principal access could be made from Kings Road providing enough land was allowed to widen the road at that point.</p>		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy
	Paul Farmer				<p>5.24 The recent developer's consultation on a potential application for the Weymed Site has shown the need for new buildings there to avoid overshadowing the existing properties in Sparhawk Street, St Mary's Square and Honey Hill. In developing this and the Shire Hall site, careful attention will need to be made to the road layout and traffic flows in the immediate area, which may have to be improved.</p> <p>5.25 Any development adjacent to Nelson Road should be in keeping with this unique row of Victorian/Edwardian semi-detached properties.</p>		The issues in relation to the Weymed and Shire Hall site are noted. Design issues are considered at the planning application stage.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15783	Rob Stanton			no	<p>As a resident of the Millgate Development in Cotton Lane, Bury St Edmunds, I wish to object to the idea of a new access road across the water meadow from the Tesco roundabout to the proposed new car park in Ram Meadow for three reasons.</p> <p>1. This is ancient water meadow, supporting an abundance of wildlife, as well as providing an amenity area for residents of the Eastgate ward to exercise themselves, their dogs, and allow children to safely explore a valuable wildlife area.</p> <p>2. The cost of construction of this road is entirely unnecessary - at the moment the access to Eastgate Street copes well with the traffic from the existing car park and the Millgate Cotton lane development. All that will be added to the traffic will be the extra from the proposed new housing development, which the existing access will still be able to cope with.</p>		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access. This will have a positive impact on the historic streets which are currently congested with traffic accessing the car park from Mustow Street.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
	Rob Stanton				<p>3. Access to and from the proposed new road will be onto an already busy road (A143) , with poor sight lines, which will also disrupt existing traffic flow in and out of Bury St Edmunds along the A143, as well as adding huge unnecessary cost.</p> <p>I realise I may have to wait a moment or two longer to exit from Cotton Lane into Eastgate Street, but would rather retain the amenity of the water meadow, and, at the same time, save huge amounts of money building an entirely unnecessary road.</p>		See above	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15796	Grace Cook			no	<p>With reference to the parcel of land known as site BV10(g) and your proposal that it is indicative of 12 dwellings:</p> <p>As I live right next to this piece of land, which is unsightly and used by youngsters as a meeting place, I would like nothing more than for it to be tidied up but I do have concerns about it being developed. The main concerns I have are related to access and parking as the roads are already often down to one lane as they are used not only by residents but also by staff and visitors to the offices as you enter the estate and by people who leave their cars there all day while they go town or work nearby. I have personally had one or two near misses with people coming round the corners too fast only to find we are both on the same side of the road. More houses means more cars, more congestion, more noise and it must be taken into account that the Abbots Gate site itself has yet be completed by Land Charter so we have as yet to see the full effect the completed site will have on the only access to the site.</p>		The access to the site would be from the existing Laundry Lane access. Parking to serve the development will be in accordance with the adopted standards at the time of any application for development. Landscaping and design will be dealt with as part of any application for development on the site and will be in accordance with policies in the Local Plan.	No changes required
	Grace Cook				<p>My other concern is that it is taken into account that this parcel of land is somewhat lower than where my house is and the last thing I would want is for someone's bedroom window to be looking straight into my lounge or onto my terrace anymore than I suspect they would want my view to be into their bedrooms. I trust trees would be left and hopefully more planted. Without wanting to appear a NIMBY one of the things that attracted me to this house was the meadow land which will never be built on (I'm assured) and its sense of peace. If more housing has to be put on this land it must be looked at sympathetically to the those already here especially the residents of the Lydgate Court retirement apartments and myself.</p>		See above	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15803	Peter Leveritt			no	<p>Thank you for the letter referring to land at Jacqueline Close and the proposal for housing. I have lived in 73 Kings Road for over 12 years and have enjoyed it immensely. I feel its not such a great idea building more houses in this area and bringing more traffic to this area. I would like to see the evidence to support such claims that the road system could support the developers plans. What concerns me is the demolition of the garages at either end of the proposed plot. Where are you expecting these cars to be parked and will there be provision for those people who own garages there? From my previous dealings with Tony Bickers the previous Land agent involved with the previous application the answer was that there was none had none and that the developer simply did not care either!</p> <p>Great I thought.</p> <p>I would be interested to know what the latest answer is?</p> <p>Are the houses to be built 2 storey or 3 storey?</p>		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
	Peter Leveritt				<p>The land at the present is used by people walking their dogs and serves as great natural space in a town environment this is without doubt a positive direction .</p> <p>Why not develop this way instead ?</p> <p>There is original cart track that runs through the land has rights to pass over it has rights I believe from some of the houses at the end of Kings road. The blocking off of this at the Mill road end would put a end to this .</p> <p>Is this legal?</p>		See above	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	Society generally supports new brown field housing sites as identified within the town. However, the Society considers that the document should stress more strongly that each of the sites should be planned with the greatest sensitivity and respect for its neighbours. We query whether there are sufficient staffing levels to meet this challenge. Perhaps the Authority might consider the use of an inclusive design panel with representatives of the local community to assist. Could the document call for a proportion of live and work' homes? Could the document also indicate how the timetable for the development of these sites will relate to the programme for out of town schemes - will they be given priority?		The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	<p>Jacqueline Close/ Old Hospital site should not be included at this stage until two major issues have been addressed. There must be detailed investigation and assessment of these and costed plans for solving them.</p> <p>i) Plans for suitable Infrastructure (especially road and other access) to the site must be developed. These must include existing roads, services etc surrounding the site which are, at present, unsuitable for taking such traffic. There must be strategic planning before it is considered suitable for development.</p> <p>ii) A complete survey of and engineering solution for the old mine workings and quarry on the site must be carried out. The effect of engineering works on surrounding land and existing properties in the area must be fully investigated and evaluated before it is considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The Jacqueline Close part of the site may be better considered for development as Green Infrastructure see section 14.11</p>	no	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15918	Alan Murdie					no	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15919	Richard Miller			no	<p>1. The area designated covers private gardens which are not brownfield land and which are used in lieu of an allotment.</p> <p>2. The area designated, were it to be developed, would remove already limited parking including garaging facilities to several properties.</p> <p>3. Access to the designated area from the North and East would require increased traffic on King's Road, Shillitoe Close and Mill Road. These are all within a conservation area and already suffer from slow traffic exiting onto Parkway at peak periods.</p> <p>4. As the Sustainability Appraisal Report makes clear: "the potential for significant negative effects is predicted against water consumption levels and the quality of water resources; flood risk; the generation and management of waste; sustainable transport and traffic congestion; noise pollution; the quality of countryside; greenhouse gas emission levels, air quality targets" etc.</p>		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Miller				<p>a. East Anglia is suffering from a lack of water due to climate change. It is very worrying that the designated area for development "is located within a groundwater source protection zone 1 and is within a major aquifer area (i.e. providing a high level of water storage)." Developing any of this land would be short sighted.</p> <p>b. The allocations BV10b and BV10d, BV10e, BV10g, BV10k are located in Flood Zone 2. In addition, allocation BV10j is located with both Flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>5. The Sustainability Appraisal report claims that developing the designated area would 'maintain and improve levels of education' as there are schools with spare capacity. This is selective reporting; St Louis Middle and St James Middle report being regularly oversubscribed as indeed are King Edward VI and County Upper and St Benedict's (http://sccrw.onesuffolk.co.uk/EducationAndLearning/Schools/ListOfSuffolkSchools/AtoZofSuffolkschoolsbyvillagetown.htm)</p>		The Council agrees that water (and energy) efficiency are of vital importance. This issue needs to be tackled in both new, and existing, buildings. We are working continually with the county council to ensure any requirements as a result of SOR are reflected in the Vision.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Miller				<p>6. On Warren's 1776 map limekilns are shown on the southern side of Field Lane (now Kings Road). In the wider area there was another kiln at the end of Chalk Lane (Now Chalk Road) as shown on the 1886 Ordnance Survey map and further kilns were located in the area of Out Westgate and Hospital Road. The kiln at the end of Chalk Lane was supplied with chalk dug from galleried chalk mines. The galleries appear to have been to the north and south of Jacqueline Close.</p> <p>a. In the book 'Urban Land: Degradation, Investigation, Remediation', D. Genske, 2003, (ISBN 3-540-43845-9) the area around Jacqueline Close is cited as a case study into subsidence due to the collapse of old mine workings. The diagrams included in this study and the findings of an equipotential resistivity survey that there could be other workings in the area must surely concern any prospective developer.</p>		See above	Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
	Richard Miller				<p>b. I am led to believe that in the 1970s the LA purchased the site, stripped it down to the chalk, placed geotextile and covered it with soil. Denske reports that the area 'then became a recreational area but was monitored for ground movement'. To the best of my knowledge no further work was done on the site.</p> <p>c. BV10 (b/c) is supposed to be developed as a 'whole' site. One suspects that this cannot be done safely.</p> <p>d. There is a risk that any housing built would be difficult to sell once prospective buyers were made aware of the history of the area and previous building projects disappearing into holes as deep as 12m!</p> <p>7. The designated area has greater potential if it is managed as green space for the existing communities nearby.</p>		See above	Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Brownfield before greenfield.	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>5.21 Bury St Edmunds Garden Centre</p> <p>The Garden Centre site lies within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) on our flood maps. There has been no consideration to Flood Risk on this site. The sequential test approach should be applied to the site for directing development away from flood risk sensitive areas, as set out in the NPPF. Again, this may result in the reduction of developable yield at the site. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment would need to be undertaken to properly assess the implications of flood risk and inform the decision-making process.</p> <p>5.24 Shire Hall Site, Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>We have had pre-development discussions with the promoters of this site. This has included the production and review of a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which has demonstrated that the site can be appropriately developed without being at risk of flooding and without causing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere.</p>		The number of dwellings on the Bury Garden centre site has been reduced to 30 due to the environmental constraints on the site. The comments in relation to Shire Hall are noted. The flood risk on the garages and bus depot site is acknowledged and development will be located accordingly.	No changes required
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>5.30 Garages and Bus Depot, Cotton Lane</p> <p>There is a possibility that the site may be contaminated by its current uses. Therefore if this site is to be developed, the land should be investigated appropriately with suitable remedial measures taken if contaminated is identified.</p> <p>The site lies within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) on our flood maps. There has been no consideration to Flood Risk on site. Therefore a sequential approach should be taken to direct development away from sensitive areas of flood risk, as set out in the NPPF. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment would need to be undertaken to properly assess the implications of flood risk and inform the decision-making process.</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	Brownfield sites should always be a priority for redevelopment. As part of an overall strategy, there is no reason why Greenfield development should not be dependent on Brownfield site restoration and development by developers.		The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the high quality redevelopment of vacant or underused brownfield sites for more productive uses.</p> <p>We note that 816 units are proposed under Policy BV10 with a further 75 units proposed at Vinefields i.e. nearly 900 units in total.</p> <p>Many of the sites proposed adjoin A14 junctions and other areas of known, existing rush-hour stress.</p> <p>a. A14 Junction 43 Tayfen Road & Station Hill - 400 units proposed.</p> <p>b. A14 Junction 44 Shire Hall, Garden Centre, Almoners Barn - 130 units proposed plus the part impact of the Jacqueline Close / Hospital site with 105 units proposed here.</p> <p>c. Eastgate Street Vinefields, Cotton Lane, Ram Meadow - 210 units proposed.</p>	no opinion	The cumulative impact of development in and around Bury St Edmunds is considered in the Vision document and more specifically in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies the Vision.	No changes required
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			We submit that the cumulative impact of these sites should be regarded as a strategic site in its own right along with the 5 growth locations proposed for the periphery of the town. The mitigation of this cumulative impact - for example, in terms of transport, utility, education and community infrastructure - should be assessed and applied in proportion to its significant scale through the Action Plan, the IDP and the LDF generally.		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15938	Trevor Ashton			no	<p>Comments regarding Council Site ref. BV10(g) Location Almoners Barn, Cullum Road</p> <p>This site is deemed suitable for housing. The larger development on the former Hardwick Industrial Estate does not have access onto Cullum Road. Cullum Road is becoming increasingly busy and traffic is often backed up to the Westgate Brewery road, and not only at peak times, therefore the entrance to this site must not be onto Cullum Road but must use the existing access at the bottom of Laundry Lane.</p>		The access to the site would be from the existing Laundry Lane access.	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	<p>While we are in favour of this policy we emphasise the need for these sites to be redeveloped for housing and not for other purposes. This is particularly important, not only because of their locations but also in relation to promoting sustainable development, and reducing the need for travel. There is a danger that, in allocating five major greenfield sites on the periphery of the town, the brownfield sites will not receive the priority for development that their status demands. As Core Strategy Policy CS1 makes clear 'opportunities to use previously developed land and buildings for new development will be maximised through a sequential approach to the identification of development locations in settlements'. While we accept that the development of previously developed sites needs to be balanced with the release of greenfield land for development, we urge that every effort be made to achieve the development of the brownfield sites as early as possible in the forthcoming plan period.</p>		The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15942	Tom & Vicky Kingsnorth			no	We do not agree with the current proposals for multi-access points as Kings Road is categorically not suitable for any more traffic volume than currently uses the road. With the additional residents parking bays being introduced along Kings Road, which we entirely agree with to help residents and as a traffic calming scheme, the viability of this road being an access point to a new development diminishes even further. Petticoat Lane is much, much wider and has significantly less traffic volume and would therefore be much, much better suited as an access point to any development in that area. A development on the scale proposed will create a very, very significant increase in traffic volume, hence why Kings Road is most definitely not suitable to cope with this.		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no	Bury St Edmunds is overrun with houses.	no	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR15946	Michael Brabrook			yes	I believe Bury's brownfield sites should be developed. Many houses in Bury have large gardens which could support infill development. Bury's town centre can be developed by converting disused shops into dwellings.		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch				I agree with some brownside sites being used but in the question of Jacqueline Close it's not viable for re development. The land between Jacqueline Close & Kings Road could be used for development but the loss of an ancient Orchard is something I object to. I also object to the loss of two garages I rent, one in Shillitoe Close and the other off Mill Road. The present infrastructure would not be able to cope with increase in traffic in King Road, Shillitoe Close and other nearby roads.	no opinion	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15949	Mrs Suzanne Murrell			no	Jacqueline Close (Hospital site) should be left to the myriad wildlife forms there. The chalk workings have already given the area Heartbreak Close in the national press. Developing here, & Hosp. (Workhouse) sites, will create havoc to the quiet of Shillitoe Close where many frail tenants live. N.B. Adjacent area of rec. open space - is this the cemetery?	no opinion	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15950	Elsa Finch				I agree with some brownside sites being used but in the question of Jacqueline Close it's not viable for re development. The land between Jacqueline Close & Kings Road could be used for development but the loss of an ancient Orchard is something I object to. I also object to the loss of two garages I rent, one in Shillitoe Close and the other off Mill Road. The present infrastructure would not be able to cope with increase in traffic in King Road, Shillitoe Close and other nearby roads.	no opinion	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15953	Wendie and Peter Summers				<p>In principle we do not object to the use of the land for residential use it is an attractive site close to the town centre amenities which we all enjoy, however we would like to bring your attention to the following issues.</p> <p>1) Vehicle access to the site must be via Kings Road not Mill Road which is very narrow and congested with parked cars.</p>		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
	Wendie and Peter Summers				<p>2) As part of the planning consent provision must be made for parking for the residents of Mill Road who currently use the garages on the land in question (in the region of 40 cars are regularly parked on the land) Mill road is very congested with parked cars in the evenings to the extent that one pavement is completely out of use and the other cannot be used if an ordinary car comes down the road, as in order to get down the road cars must mount the opposite pavement. Pedestrians have to take refuge in front gardens, or squeeze between parked cars in order to let vehicles come through. This is even more difficult for mums with pushchairs, wheelchair users or cyclists. Any additional parking on Mill Road would make the situation even more dangerous and inconvenient for car users and pedestrians alike. This coupled with the likely increase in pedestrian use of Mill Road from the residents of the new development- would be an accident waiting to happen</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wendie and Peter Summers				3) Consideration to access for 100 new dwellings must include the flow of traffic up and down Victoria Street and Albert Street, both of which are narrow and especially Victoria Street lined with parked cars. These are popular routes in and out of the area for those travelling west towards the A14 and Cambridge. It may be necessary to make these streets one way (One each way) as it is often impossible for two vehicles to pass on these streets, and an increase in traffic volume will cause serious problems. In addition some priority lights may be needed at the roundabout at Kings Road/ Parkway junction at busy times. The flow of traffic up parkway often makes exit onto that roundabout from Kings Road quite difficult, and it already becomes congested back to Chalk Road with cars waiting to get onto parkway.		See	No changes required
	Wendie and Peter Summers				4) Some of the proposed site should be set aside for a children's' play area or public open space - there is very little space for children to play in the area at the moment- the nearest playgrounds being at the West Suffolk College (Across a busy main road) or the Gainsborough Road recreation park, which is too far for young children to go on their own. A high density housing development will increase the number of young families in the area, increasing demand for this type of facility - this is an opportunity for the council to improve the provision of play areas in this densely populated part of town whilst still allowing residential development to take place.		See above	No changes required
	Wendie and Peter Summers				I am sure there are many other considerations for the council on this development but as residents who are in a position to observe the current situation on a day to day basis we hope that these comments will be taken into account. We have no children and plenty of parking on our own land so our comments are made genuinely in the interests of the whole community, both existing and extended as new housing is built.		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15956	Miss Caroline Pettitt			no	BV10(b) Jacqueline Close. The western boundary of this plot should not include into Shillitoe Close. This land is the garden for the residents. it is green, open space with grass and trees, used by the local residents, children and pets for exercise and enjoyment. It is greenfield land NOT brownfield, and should be protected from development.		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	Please use brownfield sites before starting on greenfield sites.	no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree except for School Yard. Both current temporary car parks should be made permanent and confined exclusively to low emission cars		The council supports low emission vehicles and a decision on an alternative low emission car park would be made at a later date.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no	Policy BV10 allocates several sites for mixed use development. Neither the policy nor supporting text specifies a quantum of floorspace for either convenience or comparison development at these sites. It should be made clear for the avoidance of doubt that no retail will be permitted on these sites under the term 'mixed use'. Where retail development is promoted, it should comply with the requirements of the NPPF sequential and retail impact tests (paragraphs 24 and 26).	no opinion	The mixed use sites have been removed from BV10 to avoid repetition of dwelling numbers in BV8 and BV9. An additional paragraph has been inserted in the supporting text to BV9 to clarify that the floorspace should accord with the 2012 retail appraisal.	The mixed use sites have been removed from BV10 to avoid repetition of dwelling numbers in BV8 and BV9. An additional paragraph has been inserted in the supporting text to BV9 to clarify that the floorspace should accord with the 2012 retail appraisal.
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15976	Richard Scales	Modece Architects			<p>BV10(b): live at 69 Mill Road IP33 3NJ. I own a garage to the rear of my house and have right of way to the garage. The garage and right of way are included within the area marked up for redevelopment. Please will you ensure that the boundaries for the site are redrawn so that the land I own and the right of access are excluded from the redevelopment plan.</p> <p>The attached plan shows the garage and the right of access.</p> <p>Please will you send me a copy of the amended drawing to make sure that this land is excluded from the redevelopment plan.</p>		The garages are included as part of the redevelopment area. If these are in private ownership it is within the owners right to not see development on their land. This matter would be determined during the production of a site development brief which will be subject to full public consultation.	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	There can be no doubt the preservation of food producing areas has to be paramount which necessitates on every occasion the redevelopment of brownfield sites. The Question should not only centre on housing but other uses if practical and applicable.	no opinion	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The difficulty of developing Jacqueline Close will result in developers not delivering affordable housing.		The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15983	Paul Elkin				<p>The long-term future of the Lark Valley and its associated water meadows.</p> <p>2.1 It would be excellent to see a much stronger policy for retaining as much as possible of the currently undeveloped area of the Lark Valley as publicly accessible open areas or agricultural land with clearly defined public access routes. Despite the involvement of the Princes Trust in terms of commenting on the proposals for the urban development of the Lark Valley between the A134 and the present route of the A14, I think any further development in this sector other than already exists in the form of the BP garage with its Marks and Spencer food outlet, the police holding facility and the Wyevale garden centre is extremely hard to justify. Development of any kind here should only be in the very long term or only as a matter of last resort.</p>		The Lark Valley corridor is included as a priority in the new policy BV28 Green Infrastructure.	New policy BV28 on Green Infrastructure inserted
	Paul Elkin				<p>2.2 I query the suggestion to relocate the existing large lorry park. has a better alternative site been identified? Might the existing lorry park be converted into a Park and Ride car park served by short interval small-bus services the town centre, its railway station and so forth as well as existing 'industrial estates' such as those at Moreton Hall and Suffolk Business Park.</p>		Recent evidence has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Elkin				2.3 Vision 2031 should also include in my opinion a proposal to reinstate the run-down car park and football ground in Ram Meadow as publicly accessible and picturesque water meadows to be clearly linked by waterside walkways through Abbey Gardens to the other surviving sections of the river Lark water meadows such as No-man's meadows and beyond. Also if McCrae Farms ceases to use its field Bv10 for agricultural purposes, again a great delight for those who value the open aspect of this area so close the urban centre, it should be retained as informal leisure open space to compliment No-Mans Meadows and existing walk-ways with additional woodland tree planting (as on the Moreton hall side of the A14) to further screen off motorway noise and visual intrusion.		The water meadows are an important environmental and landscape feature in the town and this is recognised in the Vision document.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	Anglian Lane Industrial Estate will be past its useful lifespan in 20 years. Sentinel works, Northgate Ave. Howard Middle School - it will be closed as will Horringer Court.	yes	There is no evidence to support the comments. The Council is working closely with the county council to ensure the needs of the schools reorganisation review will be taken into account.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Perhaps the indicative number of houses proposed need reducing	no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Noting the objective to develop brownfield land set out in the Core Strategy, the county council welcomes the priority given to the development of brownfield land. Regarding the potential for heritage assets at sites a), b), c), e), f), g), j) and k), we have no objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Sites h) and i) have been covered by answers 10 and 11. Regarding site d), The northern part of this option lies within a Scheduled Monument (DSF 15998). Any development within this area will, therefore, require Scheduled Monument Consent. This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation and early discussions with English Heritage will be required to discuss the scope and feasibility of development within this area. In the southern part, no objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.		The comments are noted and the issues will be dealt with as part of any applications for development on the sites	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society strongly supports the mixed use development of this site as a sequentially preferential site. The Society wishes to secure the redevelopment of PDL before greenfield sites are released. The Society has some concerns regarding the loss of the existing hospital site as a very accessible site for town residents. It is suggested that this site could be retained in health related uses even in the event that a new campus is developed elsewhere.		It is acknowledged that the existing site is accessible to residents of the town centre, but the hospital serves the needs of the whole of West Suffolk. The future of the present site will need to be assessed should the move to Westley take place towards the end of the plan period.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16020	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	Frontier Key Fund	yes	We agree with the allocation of the Tayfen Road site for residential redevelopment, as part of a wider mix of uses. We also confirm that the site is suitable for that housing development within the next 20 years, with the detailed programme being subject to currently emerging changes to the development scheme, which are likely to progress through proposed changes to the adopted Masterplan.		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	<p>Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Bury St. Edmunds Garden Centre This should not be considered for development. Unlike many of the other designated sites, it is a thriving business and valued by local residents. It is also close to the Town centre and thus helps to reduce the travel carbon footprint of local residents. Development would also add to the already intolerable levels of traffic on Rougham Road at peak times.</p> <p>Designated Brownfield Sites Shown in BV10 No development should be considered on any Greenfield sites until all Brownfield sites are developed. Any development of Brownfield sites must be subject to the details of the master plans being agreed by local residents.</p> <p>Previously Developed Land [Brownfield], Item 5.19, Page 31 of Vision We are concerned that the wording on 'garden grabbing' is indecisive. By leaving unnecessary options open and having a too flexible approach, the position could easily be exploited by unscrupulous owners/developers.</p>	no	The garden centre site is privately owned and has been promoted to the council as a site available for development. The site will eventually be surrounded by development once the south east strategic site is completed and within this context the site is suitable for development. The number of dwellings on the site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints.	Number of dwellings reduced to 30

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			Under such conditions, the initiative and control as to what should or should not be built could easily pass out the hands of the Council into those of the developer. The Government made it clear in their letter to local authorities in June 2010 that 'garden grabbing' is unacceptable. This has now been incorporated into the National Planning Policy Framework. Also, Page 14, item 53 of the Framework states that 'Local Authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens where, for example, development would cause harm to the local area' Additionally, on page 155, the Framework has clarified that previously developed land excludes private residential gardens. The reference in the Vision document as gardens being previously developed or brown-field land is therefore incorrect.		The Council agrees that the approach could be clearer and the paragraph amended	Paragraph 5.19 has been amended to clarify distinction between previously developed land and garden land.
	Michael Schultz				Two examples of the worst kind of 'garden grabbing' and cramming can be seen in the consents given for planning applications SE/07/0844 and SE/07/0705. Both of these consents compromised the settings and character of the area. We believe, therefore, that a stronger, clearer approach should be taken by the Council by stating that, in general, development on large gardens will be resisted. There are few areas with large gardens left in the Town.		The Council agrees that the approach could be clearer and the paragraph amended	Paragraph 5.19 has been amended to clarify distinction between previously developed land and garden land.
BVR16026	R D Davison	Lacy Scott & Knight			I write to confirm our endorsement of St Edmundsbury's principles as stated for the easterly part of the site as potential for redevelopment at some future point for retail and office use thereby supporting the objective of enhancing the vitality for this part of the town centre.		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	<p>Provided the age-old problem of access to/from and adequate infrastructure is dealt with. This has NOT been addressed in the past - as Moreton Hall problems have shown. "Let's build and put our heads in the ground" seems to have been the attitude.</p> <p>Almost certainly there are other sites - must be looked at and as stated before, give to the developers some finance to encourage them to explore the possibility of using ALL brownfield sites.</p>	yes	The support is welcomed. There is an infrastructure delivery plan which accompanies the document which sets out how the infrastructure to support the growth can be delivered	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	<p>BV10 (b) Jacqueline Close: Intrusion of western boundary of this site into Shillitoe Close should be deleted. It affects the residents garaging and also their garden (grassland and trees for their enjoyment) which is greenfield land not brownfield. Access to the northern half of this site should be the most direct route, on Kings Road between No 64 and No 69, and not a roundabout route through Shillitoe Close and via extra and dangerous junctions.</p>		The garages are included as part of the redevelopment area. If these are in private ownership it is within the owners right to not see development on their land. This matter, as well as general traffic issues, would be determined during the production of a site development brief which will be subject to full public consultation.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no	I do not agree with the proposed plans for "Land at Jacqueline Close" and "Hospital Site, Hospital Road". My objection is related to access to this site, which appears to suggest that the site will be accessible by car from Kings Road near the junction with Victoria Street. These are residential areas already heavily used by through traffic, especially during rush hours. Moreover, we have had a serious accident in this area only last year, where pedestrians (on the pavement!!!) were hit by a car. From a safety point of view, it is completely unacceptable to have the additional potential traffic related to the newly proposed developments go through Victoria street/kings road.	no opinion	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
	B Gottgens				On an aside, parking in this part of town is already a real issue. Residents have parking permits, but still commonly find themselves having to park more than a hundred yards away from their home. A mother having to carry her shopping + babies along these roads is bad enough. Adding the potential hazards of extra traffic related to over new 100 houses is madness, and it would be the direct responsibility of the councillors if anything was to happen. A potential feast day for lawyers!!!		See above	See above
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no		no opinion	No explanation if provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			no		no opinion	No explanation if provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes	As long as housing is large enough & not the rabbit hutches often build each property needs private garden & parking...affordable & NOT for the developers benefit	no opinion	Comments noted	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes	Brownfield sites should be developed as a priority in front of any greenfield sites.	no opinion	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	Ensure development is housing and not other purposes. This is important in relation to reducing the need to travel and for sustainable development.	yes	A range of sites are allocated in the document including mixed use, housing and employment to ensure the needs of the town are met in a sustainable manner.	No changes required
BVR21578E	Gregory Gray Associates		The Garden Centre Group	yes	No changes required.	no	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	Take out plans which are costly and have little value for the people living or working in the town.	no opinion	A range of sites are allocated in the document including mixed use, housing and employment to ensure the needs of the town are met in a sustainable manner.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no			No explanation if provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no	I believe it is unacceptable to build a road on a greenfield site to allow you to develop a brownfield site especially as it has a current use.	no opinion	The road to serve Ram Meadow will ensure that unacceptable traffic impacts on the historic parts of the town are minimised.	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	Wherever possible brownfield sites should be prioritised for development before using new land for building.	no opinion	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21663E	Mr Richard Miller			no	<p>1. The area designated covers private gardens which are not brownfield land and which are used in lieu of an allotment.</p> <p>2. The area designated, were it to be developed, would remove already limited parking including garaging facilities to several properties.</p> <p>3. Access to the designated area from the North and East would require increased traffic on King's Road, Shillitoe Close and Mill Road. These are all within a conservation area and already suffer from slow traffic exiting onto Parkway at peak periods.</p>	no opinion	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr Richard Miller				<p>4. As the Sustainability Appraisal Report makes clear: "the potential for significant negative effects is predicted against water consumption levels and the quality of water resources; flood risk; the generation and management of waste; sustainable transport and traffic congestion; noise pollution; the quality of countryside; greenhouse gas emission levels, air quality targets" etc.</p> <p>a. East Anglia is suffering from a lack of water due to climate change. It is very worrying that the designated area for development "is located within a groundwater source protection zone 1 and is within a major aquifer area (i.e. providing a high level of water storage)." Developing any of this land would be short sighted.</p> <p>b. The allocations BV10b and BV10d, BV10e, BV10g, BV10k are located in Flood Zone 2. In addition, allocation BV10j is located with both Flood zones 2 and 3.</p>		The number of dwellings take account of environmental constraints, including flood zones.	No changes required
	Mr Richard Miller				<p>5. The Sustainability Appraisal report claims that developing the designated area would maintain and improve levels of education as there are schools with spare capacity. This is selective reporting; St Louis Middle and St James Middle report being regularly oversubscribed as indeed are King Edward VI and County Upper and St Benedict's (http://sccrw.onesuffolk.co.uk/EducationAndLearning/Schools/ListOfSuffolkSchools/AtoZofSuffolkschoolsbyvillagetown.htm)</p> <p>6. On Warrens 1776 map limekilns are shown on the southern side of Field Lane (now Kings Road). In the wider area there was another kiln at the end of Chalk Lane (Now Chalk Road) as shown on the 1886 Ordnance Survey map and further kilns were located in the area of Out Westgate and Hospital Road. The kiln at the end of Chalk Lane was supplied with chalk dug from galleried chalk mines. The galleries appear to have been to the north and south of Jacqueline Close.</p>		The Council is and will continue to work closely with the County Council over needs arising from the schools reorganisation review.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr Richard Miller				<p>a. In the book Urban Land: Degradation, Investigation, Remediation, D. Genske, 2003, (ISBN 3-540-43845-9) the area around Jacqueline Close is cited as a case study into subsidence due to the collapse of old mine workings. The diagrams included in this study and the findings of an equipotential resistivity survey that there could be other workings in the area must surely concern any prospective developer.</p> <p>b. I am led to believe that in the 1970s the LA purchased the site, stripped it down to the chalk, placed geotextile and covered it with soil. Denske reports that the area then became a recreational area but was monitored for ground movement. To the best of my knowledge no further work was done on the site.</p>		The number of dwellings on the site has been reduced in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site	Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.
	Mr Richard Miller				<p>c. BV10 (b/c) is supposed to be developed as a whole site. One suspects that this cannot be done safely.</p> <p>d. There is a risk that any housing built would be difficult to sell once prospective buyers were made aware of the history of the area and previous building projects disappearing into holes as deep as 12m!</p> <p>7. The designated area has greater potential if it is managed as green space for the existing communities nearby.</p>		See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			no	Development is proposed through a designated flood plain, altering this area would put existing properties at risk. Green open area rich in wildlife, also used recreationally by local residents. New road would cause additional noise and traffic pollution for existing residents. New link road would also increase traffic congestion affecting main access roads into town: A14, Compiegne Way, Fornham Road, Tayfen Road. Congestion in these areas would be increased considerably if development of Station Hill and Tayfen Road were given the go ahead. It appears that the new road linking Compiegne Way to the new Car Park has been designed as a through road to Eastgate Street and if required could be easily be opened up, this is suspicious and causes major concerns.		The number of dwellings on the site is in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site. This, and the location of dwellings, will be confirmed through a site development brief	No changes required
	Elizabeth Ellis				If development of the Ram Meadow car park goes ahead I am concerned as to the large number of houses and type of dwellings located in such a small area. Social Housing should be positioned so that it would affect existing residents the least. Concerns are raised as to the locality, proximity and height of new buildings as this would affect privacy and natural light to existing properties. I object to new allotments replacing the open green recreational area created for local residents since the creation of the Millgate development (along Barwell Road).		See above	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		yes	Redelopment of wasteland is a good idea as long as it does not affect existing businesses as these provide vital local jobs.		Comments noted	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		no	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	yes	As Chairman of The Risbygate Street Traders Association, the development of Schoolyard (Section 5.25, Page 32) was discussed at our last meeting in some depth. As an organisation, we feel strongly that the land in Schoolyard and into Risbygate Street should be used as retail on the ground floor with living accommodation above, NOT JUST LIVING ACCOMMODATION. We wish to see Risbygate Street thrive as a shopping street and want visitors to shop and eat here as any part of a shopping trip to Bury St Edmunds. We want School Yard carefully and thoughtfully integrated to ensure people visit the street to shop. With just residential development, this would not be the case, and would be detrimental to the current businesses in the street, many who have been here for ten's of years.	no opinion	The comments are noted. The council encourages mixed uses in the town centre	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes	Brown field every time.	no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		no opinion	No explanation if provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes	YES YES YES. Please read 5.19 which is at the heart of the misconception of 2031 - 'greenfield sites...a last resort...'. Why do you not develop the brownfield sites FIRST primarily to provide the much needed social housing. Countrywide developers cite the greenfield sites as 'oven ready'. A developer doesn't want to spend money on the brownfield sites but that is no reason why they should be offered up first.	no opinion	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion	Recommendation that that there is consultation with health on whether/not a health impact assessment should be done to ensure there is explicit consideration of the impact on human health e.g. development of potentially contaminated sites.	no opinion	The contamination of sites is dealt with at an early stage in the planning process and developers will be required to undertake remedial measures to ensure any contamination is fully remedied.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 12: Housing on Brownfield Sites in Bury St Edmunds (BV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites for development?	Question 12b - If not, what changes do you require and why?	Question 12c - Are there other brownfield sites that are suitable for housing development that could come forward in the next 20 years?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21727E	Tim Harbord	West Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust	Tim Harbord Associates	yes	However, object to the omission of the site comprising West Suffolk Hospital, St. Nicholas's Hospice, the Wedgwood Centre and Childcare Facility, from the list of brownfield sites allocated for development within the period of the Plan under Policy BV10. Please see supporting statement and accompanying drawing no. 2126/03B for reasons, together with copies of the submission made in December 2008 in response to the Site Allocations Issues and Options Document.	yes	The location of the new hospital has been considered and confirmed by the adopted Core Strategy. It will not be required until towards the end of the plan period, during which time details of the requirements of the hospital, and its existing site, can be developed further.	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	First, second and third brown field sites must come before greenfield. To do otherwise is a travesty for future generation with dual requirement of energy and food from arable land now with us.	no opinion	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		no opinion	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15733	Mr and Mrs m E Veale	n/a		no	<p>The plan printed on page 34 under 5.33 albeit on a small scale suggests for the first time that all the public amenity land adjacent to Barwell Road is to be redeveloped entirely as allotments. This was not the intention indicated on the original development plan. The two existing public gardens and the balancing pond have disappeared and the whole public amenity area has been apparently allocated as intended allotments.</p> <p>As a resident of Barwell Road this is not acceptable and destroys the public open space outlook replacing it with presumably fenced off allotments with ad hoc jerry built buildings and boundaries constructed with corrugated sheeting and other scrap metal.</p>			This plan was for indicative purposes only and will not be included in the next draft of the document. A development brief will determine the location of uses on the site.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I like the idea of restoring the meadow pasture and enhancing the footpaths. Please could you ensure that this proposal makes provision for a riverside footpath linking up with others, as this would be a considerable asset for residents and visitors.	yes		Issues such as footpath provision will be looked at during the production of the development brief. This support is welcomed.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	We believe this proposal is generally to the benefit of the area but will require extensive consultation with residents etc. Also funds from redevelopment should be used to provide additional parking at new football site.			Consultation with the local community will take place during the production of the development brief.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15813	SEBC Property Services	SEBC Property Services	John Popham	no	Please see attached Response in Support of the site allocation which contains a summary of relevant additional information about the proposed allocation which goes beyond what is published in the Bury Vision 2031 document. The Response refers to documents which have already been supplied to you but summarises conclusions which may be drawn from them.			The comments are noted. The policy has been amended to set out those studies required to help inform the site development brief. This will ensure issues such as transport, ecology, flooding and wildlife are dealt with at an early stage.	The policy has been amended to set out those studies required to help inform the site development brief.
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	We believe this proposal is generally to the benefit of the area but will require extensive consultation with residents etc. Also funds from redevelopment should be used to provide additional parking at new football site.	no opinion		Consultation with the local community will take place during the production of the development brief.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	Ticked yes but commented: Only problem is traffic density with Vinefield expansion A143 Housing	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Should not build on a floodplain - see 10.12f.			A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	As stated the Consultation is flawed as stated above. However, specifically on this area it needs to be recorded that there is a flooding risk, a danger of repetition of the floods of 1948.			A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			Question 13 - POLICY BV11: Land at Ram Meadow We have had pre-development discussions with the promoters of this site. Within this process we have outlined the future requirements for a site specific Flood Risk Assessment. This will need to demonstrate that the site can be appropriately developed without being at risk of flooding and without causing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere. This will also need to address flood risk mitigation measures and appropriate procedures for the proposed road connection and car park.			A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	This appears to be an innovative idea and we are fully supportive.			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Keep Ram Meadow as it is but update it. It does not need to move.	no opinion		The relocation of the football club has presented an opportunity for the redevelopment of the site and adjoining area which could provide additional housing and improved car parking.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15965	Gloria Davies	Lark Valley Association			<p>1) Do not agree with Proposal.</p> <p>2) Agree with proposal to re-site football stadium to Moreton Hall.</p> <p>3) Agree with route of footpath along route of River Lark.</p> <p>4) Agree with water courses and pasture being restored.</p> <p>5) Do not agree with expansion of allotments south, to area between water meadows & Barwell Road.</p> <p>6) Do not agree with residential development, which appears to be on the flood plain.</p> <p>7) Do not agree with proposed car park on existing football stadium site, which places the parking too remotely from the town centre.</p> <p>8) Do not agree with proposed vehicular link from Compiegne Way.</p> <p>9) Consider the scheme misses a never to be repeated opportunity to enhance the River Lark as a recreational/wildlife resource for the people of Bury.</p>			The illustrative plan in the draft document has no formal status. The final design of the site will need to be determined by a site development brief. A flood risk assessment and transport assessment will be required to help determine the location of development on the site.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment and transport assessment will be required.
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			no	<p>No I do not. Whoever devised this is barking mad. Don't build a car park in the middle of nowhere; don't build a link road towards the already heavily trafficked Compiegne Way but do delete the proposed allotment land beyond Barwell Road. Reasons:- The proposed car park is 10 to 12 minutes walk to both the town centre shops and the Abbey Gardens. I know this because I have timed it from the near edge of the football ground to Marks & Spencer back lobby and the main path through the Abbey Gardens via the side gate. Your own policies suggest 10 minutes as too long and John Hicks agreed in his original report. Instead, build another 100 homes to add to the 135 already planned. No need for a £4M link road.</p> <p>In 2009, Simon Collin representing SEBC Parks and me, representing Bury St Edmunds Town Council agreed that the land behind Barwell Road was unsuitable for allotment use. Instead, 38x5 rod plots were leased in a legal agreement. Jean Marsh has the file.</p>			The illustrative plan in the draft document has no formal status. The final design of the site will need to be determined by a site development brief. A flood risk assessment and transport assessment will be required to help determine the location of development on the site.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no	Policy BV11 allocates land at Ram Meadow for mixed use development, which may include commercial uses. Neither the policy nor the supporting text specifies a quantum of floorspace for either convenience or comparison development. Like Policy BV10, it should be made clear for the avoidance of doubt that no retail will be permitted on these sites under the term 'commercial uses'. Where retail development is promoted, it should comply with the requirements of the NPPF sequential and retail impact tests (paragraphs 24 and 26).			The uses on the site will be determined through a site development brief. The commercial uses on the site will not include retail development.	Amend the supporting text to clarify that commercial uses do not include retail development on this site.
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no	SEBC must take into consideration not building in flood area. Housing may be difficult/impossible to insure.	no opinion		A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The routes to the town centre need to be based on vehicular transport (public) as well as pedestrian walkways as the proposed walking distance is too great with an ageing population. Vehicle users will seek alternative parking arrangements closer to the shopping areas	no opinion		A transport assessment will be required which will help inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. Bury St Edmunds has a number of short and long stay car parks in the town to suit users requirements.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	More development will result in further infrastructure issues similar to those that the council have so far failed to address. The local members and community association will submit their informed comments and must be listened to.			Infrastructure is a key issue underpinning the delivery of Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031. Further detail is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	Reducing the car park is a joke - all vehicles from east will have to travel further through a congested town to park!	no	The 'link road' appears to go through the existing allotments - more green space obliterated?	A transport assessment will be required which will help inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. Bury St Edmunds has a number of short and long stay car parks in the town to suit users requirements.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	Traffic congestion	no opinion		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	I fear for serious congestion with regard to the car access from Compiegne Way. Many cars use that car park for business/work parking and at peak times that (new) junction will be under serious strain. Cars will be coming from town and trying to cross onto the new road. This will likely cause wholesale congestion at peak times.	no opinion		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust		no	We object to the allocation of this site for mixed use development and car parking for the following reason. This site forms an important part of the River Lark corridor through the town and development here is likely to result in the reduction of this green corridor. We are particularly concerned about the proposed access road from Compiegne Way which runs the full length of the site, destroying habitat and severing the connection between the main north-south running ditch and the River Lark. The site is known to support water vole and fragmentation of this site is likely to adversely impact on this species. We recommend that the allocation of this site for development is not included as part of this document and that a more appropriate use is identified to secure the future of this area and to implement the management recommendations made in our 2012 survey report (Suffolk Wildlife Trust report 2010).			The location of uses on the site will be determined by a site development brief. A full ecological survey will be required as part of this process.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that an ecological survey will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We have no objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Sites h) and i) have been covered by answers 10 and 11. This area could provide an important sustainable travel connection between proposed development areas and any development of the site should retain this option. Pending a fuller investigation into the transport implications of the proposed layout of the site, we do have initial concerns regarding the proposed shared-surface nature of the link road and the location of junction with Compiegne Way. We will consider these issues as part of wider work with the borough council on travel in Bury St Edmunds.			Archaeological issues will be dealt with as part any application for development on the site. A transport assessment will be required to assess highway implications. The Council will continue to work with Suffolk County in the assessment of transport implications on the site.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society welcomes proposals to deliver improved access and parking at Ram Meadow. However, the Society wishes to prevent usage as a through route			Comments noted. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). No development should be considered on any Greenfield sites until all Brownfield sites are developed. Any development of Brownfield sites must be subject to the details of the master plans being agreed by local residents.	no	Residents to agree boundary on the masterplan.	The support is welcomed. Ram Meadow is a brownfield site.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Development appears OK but what a disaster if the access is onto Compiègne Way! Has anyone tried this road am and pm?? A detailed study is needed and would a roundabout incorporating Etna Road be acceptable?	yes		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Removal of car park area - 740, retain as existing. Removal of proposed shared-surface vehicle and pedestrian link, site and CW. Reroute via Colton Lane.	no	Existing Ram Meadow to be retained in its entirety.	The relocation of the football club has presented an opportunity for the redevelopment of the site and adjoining area which could provide additional housing and improved car parking.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	The proposed link from Compiegne Way to the proposed residential development should be for pedestrians and cyclists only, not motor vehicles. Motor traffic would be a noisy, dangerous disturbance to what should be a peaceful, safe route in a natural green space/.			Comments noted. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes	Access from the A14 across the existing meadow to a car park on the existing football ground would be a great improvement, alleviating traffic in Eastgate Street and Northgate Street. It would also improve traffic flow from Cotton Lane onto Eastgate Street. The proposals seem well thought through and I fully support them. The sooner the better!!	yes		The support is welcomed. Access to the car park will be via Compiegne Way rather than the A14.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no	DO NOT CHANGE THIS SITE AT ALL. I don't have a problem with the new dwellings on the bury town fc site, but I STRONGLY OPPOSE the planned ACCESS ROAD. It will be cutting through an area right in front of our house. An area that is loved and used daily by local residents and people from further a field. Our children play there, we walk our dogs there and there is an abundance of wildlife. When we bought our house 4 years ago we we're told this area would never be built on. Putting this road in will cause danger to our children, take away a much valued area of beauty and be of absolutely no use to us. We've managed to access our properties from the ram meadow end of cotton lane with no problems at all. Putting this road through will not serve us in any way, shape or form! The new dwellings should use the existing cotton lane/ram meadow entrance as we have for 5 years.	no opinion		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			no	My primary concern is regarding the flood implications for existing properties within Eastgate ward and more specifically the Millgate development. I am aware that appropriate flood defence plans are currently in place, but that these will no longer be effective if the meadow land is developed on.	no	Leave it as develop other identified sites	A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no	Instead of building a new access road, extend the existing Barwell Road, then use a "no motor vehicles, access only" sign for the existing development. The water meadows are an important recreational and dog walking area for the locality; a new road running through the middle would not be an improvement. The question of allotments arises; these ought not to represent a priority here as they are only of interest to a minority and should follow a supply and demand market.	no opinion		The relocation of the football club has presented an opportunity for the redevelopment of the site and adjoining area which could provide additional housing and improved car parking.	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Ridiculous!!!! Too much too crowded & ridiculous to move the entrance to the car park.	no opinion		The existing access to the car park is having a negative impact on the historic centre of the town.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21445E	David Chapman			no	<p>The proposal to build on the Ram Meadow car park has several serious implications for the entire area. A positive effect is that removing the present eyesore of the bus garage and Drive Vauxhall would improve safer access to Barwell Road.</p> <p>Against this is:</p> <p>1 Risk of flooding: The increased risk of flooding in an area already prone to flooding is inevitable for three reasons. The replacement of the football pitch with the new Ram Meadow car park would result in a huge loss of soak away for rainwater. Any building of an access road from Compiègne Way would seriously effect water flow in this area. In addition, it is likely that any road building would result in loss of established trees which in turn would increase flood risk.</p> <p>2 Noise pollution: As well as further opening up the unpleasant vista from Barwell Road towards the sugar beet factory, loss of trees would reduce the filtering of noise from the A14.</p>	yes		<p>The relocation of the football club has presented an opportunity for the redevelopment of the site and adjoining area which could provide additional housing and improved car parking. A flood risk assessment will need to be provided which will help to determine those areas appropriate for development. A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.</p>	<p>Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a flood risk assessment will be required.</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Chapman				3 Security: This access road, while keeping traffic away from Cotton Lane/Mustow Street, would have serious implications for security in this area, including any new housing, as access to the A14 would be quick and easy for organised crime. 4 Congestion: Congestion in Barwell Road would be increased as drivers presently accessing Ram Meadow from the south of the town may be tempted to avoid the extra distance/time driving to Compiegne Way to gain access to the car park. This would greatly exacerbate the existing problem of people choosing to park in Barwell Road to avoid car parking charges.			See above	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Good to have the area developed. Access from Compiegne Way to Ram Meadow is a positive but need to be careful about pushing parking further out from the town centre and increasing the length of walk to town.	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Any car parking needs to be nearest the access to the town centre and any development should be at the rear unless of course the cotton lane properties can be incorporated which could provide a retail leisure area. The opening up of the car park from the Q14 would help to reduce traffic flows in the Eastgate street /angel hill area.	no opinion		Bury St Edmunds has a number of short and long stay car parks in the town to suit users requirements	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	There needs to be extensive consultation including providing any data gathered on traffic volumes as this will have a major impact on Bury Central junction and could cause even greater congestion than at present.	yes		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	leave existing car park alone. use one third of football ground for more car parking and build a 3 level group of flats.	no	any new road from this area would in itself cause traffic problems.	A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes	TRAFFIC INFER-STRUCTURE. WHERE IS IT TO COPE. GOOD SITE. BAD ROADS	yes	ROADS IN / OUT NEED TO BE SORTED / TRAFFIC FLOW	A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no	I do not believe the Ram Meadow car park should be developed. In your document you say "the number of public car parking spaces is critical to this part of the town and should not be reduced." However you are moving the car park further away from the town centre and the Abbey Gardens and reducing the amount of spaces. Let alone spoiling a beautiful green field belt in Bury St Edmunds to build an access road. This is also an area at risk of flooding and building houses here is totally unacceptable for the new properties and increasing the risk of flooding for the existing properties.	no	They should not build the link road as this will not solve any traffic congestion just increase it. Therefore you should not develop the site as you cannot increase the existing traffic in this area. You should replace the existing football club with the much needed allotments.	A transport assessment will be required which will help inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief. Bury St Edmunds has a number of short and long stay car parks in the town to suit users requirements.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Whalebelly				<p>I also believe by adding the road onto Compiegne Way you will increase the traffic congestion in this area. With a roundabout at this junction the traffic exiting the car park will have priority over the traffic exiting Bury which you have already admitted there is problem of traffic queuing along Tayfen road. I also believe people will not drive across the other side of town to get stuck in this congestions and it will put more pressures on the parking in Eastgate Street, Northgate Street and Angel Hill.</p> <p>I also disagree with the allocation of the existing amenity area to allotments. This area is used by the children on Barwell road to play in. Why should the council request such an area during development only to reallocated it to suit them. It is also not an acceptable area to have allotments.</p> <p>If this development goes ahead the people accessing the car park should be managed to ensure the Barwell Road Estate does not become a cut through.</p>			Comments noted. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access. The location of uses on the site, such as allotments, will be determined by a site development brief.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
					I am also suspicious of the car park access road becoming a through road. If this is never to be the case why is the road designed to link though, if only to have a note to say it will not be a through road. Let alone the increase queues of traffic coming into Bury. I also believe the height of any development should not be to the detriment of the existing properties. I am concerned that our property will become overlooked and shaded by any new development. I also feel any social housing should be placed where it again affects the existing properties the least.			See above	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	I also believe by adding the road onto Compiegne Way you will increase the traffic congestion in this area. With a roundabout at this junction the traffic exiting the car park will have priority over the traffic exiting Bury which you have already admitted there is problem of traffic queuing along Tayfen road. Let alone the increase queues of traffic coming into Bury.	no opinion		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	I also believe people will not drive across the other side of town to get stuck in this congestions and it will put more pressures on the parking in Eastgate Street, Northgate Street and Angel Hill.	no opinion		Bury St Edmunds has a number of short and long stay car parks in the town to suit users requirements	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes	I also disagree with the allocation of the existing amenity area to allotments. This area is used by the children on Barwell road to play in. Why should the council request such an area during development only to reallocated it to suit them. It is also not an acceptable area to have allotments.	yes		The location of uses on the site, such as allotments, will be determined by a site development brief	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	If this development goes ahead the people accessing the car park should be managed to ensure the Barwell Road Estate does not become a cut through.	no opinion		Comments noted. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	No changes required
BVR21663E	Mr Richard Miller				I am also suspicious of the car park access road becoming a through road. If this is never to be the case why is the road designed to link though, if only to have a note to say it will not be a through road.			Comments noted. The proposed access road would serve the car park only and there would be no through access.	No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			no	I also believe the height of any development should not be to the detriment of the existing properties. I am concerned that our property will become overlooked and shaded by any new development. I also feel any social housing should be placed where it again affects the existing properties the least.		Consider an affordable Park and Ride scheme, York offers its customers a fantastic service! This would cut down traffic congestion, noise and pollution and would help to preserve a beautiful, historic market town.	A development brief is required which will be subject to public consultation. Comments can also be submitted at the time of any application for development on the site.	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no				No explanation is given to support this ob	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Traffic along Eastgate Street , Northgate Street and A14 Tesco's are all problems now building here will only add extra problems. Unless its car free...	yes		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes	BUT housing is first priority, esp. social housing as the site is close to the existing amenities in the town and will relieve traffic congestion on the roads and the need to provide more public transport.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	If more residential development can be accommodated in other areas within the town, then this site should be preserved and re-developed as a green "lung" for Bury St Edmunds. Consideration should be given to the creation of further food growing space in this area - urban farm, community gardens, allotments etc	no opinion		The location of uses on the site will be determined by a site development brief	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 13: Land at Ram Meadow Bury St Edmunds (BV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with the proposal for Ram Meadow	Question 13b - If not, what changes do you suggest and why?	Question 13c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 13d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no	I don't believe enough consideration has been given to the additional traffic this will cause on Eastgate Street. In addition parking is already difficult in this area and this would mean people making even more use of free parking areas which are essentially spaces for residents. A re-think to parking permit hours would be a must. Also the area a Ram meadow is a housing a natural wildlife habitat building in this area could be to the detriment of the animals and wildlife living here already. Which includes monkjack.	yes		A transport assessment will be required which will assess the implication and inform the location of uses on the site in the site development brief.	Add appropriate wording to the policy to state that a transport assessment will be required.
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes, the town centre, where I live, is also a local centre and your policies need to take more account of the people who live there and not treat it as a focus for shopping, leisure, business and cultural activities.	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society			Society strongly supports safeguarding of existing local centres and also supports aspirations in respect of existing homes.		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	<p>We agree that the delivery of new homes at Moreton Hall should include provision for a community centre comprising a mix of uses and that Policy BV12 should refer to the provision of a new local centre serving Moreton Hall.</p> <p>To date the focus of development at Moreton Hall has been on established retail and community provision which is largely towards the western and south western parts of the built up area. The addition of a further eastward tranche of development of a significant, albeit not strategic, scale warrants the provision of a new community focus that will as much serve the existing parts of Moreton Hall lying immediately west of Lady Miriam Way and north of Mount Road comprising the area subject to the 2007 Revised Master Plan. These latter areas, which can be as much as 1300m (linear) from existing facilities, which will benefit as much from the provision of a new local centre as the development proposed in Policy BV3.</p>	yes	The comments are noted. A reference to the new local centre as part of the Moreton Hall strategic site has been made in the policy. It will be for any applicant to demonstrate the need for floorspace required if above 150sqm as stated in the policy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Whilst the footpath/cycleway routes in the existing eastern part of Moreton Hall have in part been designed to focus on schools (existing and prospective) and on the area of strategic open space, it will be appropriate to locate a Local Centre wherein it can be accessible from the existing developed area and will relate to existing development as well as having a functional relationship with the proposed urban extension.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey therefore support the Preferred Option which proposes a Local Centre in the vicinity of The Flying Fortress public house and agree the proposition set out at paragraph 16.15 (d). The area between Lady Miriam Way and the existing public house should therefore be safeguarded, nonetheless, the precise location and configuration for a local centre should be the subject of detailed design and master planning and the DPD should not militate against achieving the most suitable design having regard to a reasoned consideration of land ownerships, infrastructure capacity, accessibility and all other considerations.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>As important as the principle of creating a new social focus for the eastern part of Moreton Hall will be the content and scale of the offer.</p> <p>In relation to local retail uses we would expect the Council to permit suitable development falling in one or more of the following Use Classes: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, C2 and D1. This will enable a range of alternative provisions to be secured and should ensure the maximum opportunity to secure retail, financial and professional services and leisure uses appropriate to community needs.</p> <p>Typically a viable local centre is likely to comprise an anchor retail tenant who will provide a range of convenience goods for day to day needs, supported by at least two and up to four or five other smaller outlets available for a range of operators including hot food sales, non food retail or services.</p>		See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>The provision of a range of outlets is more likely to secure operators than that of a stand alone store as it will lend the centre a greater focal attraction as well as extending the hours in which the location is the centre of community life. Typically an anchor store will need to be in the order of 350m² (gross) with subsidiary stores not exceeding in total the floorspace of the anchor store.</p> <p>We therefore object to any implied limit of 150m² (net) as we do not believe that this is likely to enable delivery of a satisfactory user in this location. This has regard to the existing provision in Moreton Hall and to the Sainsbury store which is available to the local community but not accessible to the majority who will live in the eastern part with use of a car.</p>		See above	No changes required
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>We invite consideration of the successful provision of local centre facilities in locations such as Watton (provision of 715m² gross including an anchor store of approximately half the gross total to serve a development of about 650 houses and a catchment of 1200 - Breckland Council 3PL/2005/0476)</p> <p>In addition to retail and associated uses we support the reference to the potential for other associated uses in addition to the existing public house which may include a crèche/day nursery, nursing home or residential institution (Class C2) or leisure provisions appropriate to the location. Overall we support Policy BV12 subject to considerations of design, layout and commercial viability and will seek to engage with the Borough Council to deliver an appropriate range of uses complementary to the development of the urban extension.</p>		See above	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no		no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	The Ridley Road is the one local centre of most relevance to Westley Village. Improved foot and cycle paths through the proposed development will increase take-up of these nearby facilities. Consideration should also be given to a GP (Primary Care) surgery, and perhaps a dental surgery, which will also reduce the need for central Bury visits by road		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the approach to local centres and community facilities in terms of:</p> <p>a. A multi-sector partnership approach which works with existing groups and maximises dual use where possible.</p> <p>b. A mix of uses and walkable facilities.</p> <p>In terms of local centres and community facilities, we would submit that new development needs to be fundamentally demand driven with a flexible land use approach to reflect variable demand.</p> <p>On traditional High Streets, changes in demand are managed through the transition between commercial (office/retail), community and residential uses. This type of flexibility should also be applied to existing and new centres.</p> <p>In terms of walkable facilities, we would submit that radii/isochrones should draw from the Infrastructure & Environmental Capacity Appraisal which takes guidance from Shaping Neighbourhoods and the Urban Design Guide in terms of:</p> <p>Schools) Community centres) <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/>All operate in an 800m catchment GP services) Convenience stores)</p>	no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We support this policy which retains sites for local facilities and adds some valuable new ones. We note the suggested mix of uses which will assist in supporting local communities but draw attention to the need for funding for some elements of possible provision (e.g. health, community and education).	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	There is no requirement for another `community centre` on the Eastern side of the town. These areas act as magnets for antisocial behaviour which remains unresolved by the authorities.	yes	Local centres provide important local services and facilities for local residents which reduces the need for people to travel into the town centre to meet everyday needs.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15966	Mr J B Brennan			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	yes	See attached PDF	no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15968	Mrs I M Brennan			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree plus one more at Moreton Hall and one at each of the five intended new sites. That is 16 in all. See previous comments about no car parking at these local centres.		The policy has been amended to include the new local centres as part of the strategic growth area	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	The Moreton Hall centre shown on the diagram is the existing Lawson Place that is over-subscribed, with demand frequently greater than capacity. Why are there no local centre/community facilities shown to the east of Moreton Hall on this diagram?		The policy has been amended to include the new local centre as part of the Moreton Hall strategic growth area	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	Why are you looking to build new centres when you `wash your hands` of those already there? (Newbury Community Centre/St Olaves).	yes	Whilst the council can ensure the continued allocation of local centres to meet local needs, they are not within the council's ownership. However, the council has worked successfully in the past with local communities, such as Southgate, to ensure the success of these areas.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the safeguarding and establishment of local centres, which support sustainability through creating walkable neighbourhoods. A possible improvement for this policy would be the inclusion of a clause that requires consideration or creation of sustainable transport links (walking/cycling) for these locations.		Agree that the policy would benefit from an additional paragraph on sustainable transport links.	New paragraph inserted in BV12 around sustainable transport links.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes: but see our comments on expansion of the town in response to question 4.	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Anselm Community Centre is not listed.	yes	The policy relates to neighbourhood centres which are the main focus shops and services in a residential area.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	no	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 14: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (BV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with the list of local centres?	Question 14b - Are there other local centres that should be safeguarded?	Question 14c - Do you agree that they should be safeguarded for the identified uses?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	There is a lack on a neighbourhood centre on the extreme east of Moreton Hall. The existing centre is well used but car parking is at capacity.	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	Anselm Avenue Community Centre is not listed	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		no opinion	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion			Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		yes	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no		no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			Delivery The document, at the front end, takes the form of a community strategy for the two areas and in the last part, takes the form of a Sties Specifics DPD or AAP. Whilst broadly agreeing with the aspirations and actions in the first part, which seem logical and worthwhile, there is no indication of implementation such as time scales and responsible organisations. It is unclear how these actions will be delivered and their success monitored. Taking the document as a DPD, the Council notices that there is a lack of delivery, monitoring and implementation for the pure DPD element of the document. Although this is a Preferred Options version, the Council would have expected an outline of how the proposals will be delivered and how policy implementation will be monitored to be included at this stage in preparation of the DPD.	This vision document sets out the Council's corporate aspirations and planning policies to guide the future of the borough to 2031. A monitoring and review framework (Appendix 4) sets out the measures by which the council shall assess the success of the planning policies in the document. A delivery framework for the actions and aspirations forms evidence to accompany this document.	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	There should be much more emphasis on affordability accessibility for older people and the disabled low energy use water conservation and re-use housing only being permitted when there is employment to support it minimising hard surfaces and run-off sustainable transport links to the town centre.	The Council believes that accessibility for older and vulnerable people are emphasised in paragraph 5.40. The Council considers that the issue of a sustainability and energy use are addressed in the sustainability and climate change section of this document.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	Yes, as far as they go, but I think you need to do far more about the aesthetic design of new homes rather than just focussing upon their condition and affordability.	Agreed. This is addressed by policies contained within the draft Development management Policies document.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	No, do not accept the presumptions behind the claimed aspirations.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			We have made a number of suggestions under the relevant policy sections as detailed below. Our suggestions are not intended to prevent development to any of these strategic sites, moreover we hope that the early provision of this information relating to the site development will ensure that relevant issues are considered through the planning process. This should reduce the possibility of delays and facilitate the effective delivery of the particular site.	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson				<p>5.42 refers</p> <p>a) Agreed</p> <p>b) SEBC should consider penalties for homes left empty for longer than a modest period. They do not contribute to the local economy and by virtue of their unavailability for housing result in more houses having to be built. We understand that there are more than 1000 empty homes in Bury. A similar approach could be applied to 2nd homes.</p> <p>c to j) It is clear that more effort needs to go into providing homes that do not fit with the standard model of the nuclear family. Surely with some creative thinking we could provide a wider range of living options that will attract a broader constituency, and help reverse the trend to smaller households (e.g. <2.4 people per household)?</p> <p>For example:</p>	<p>The Council agrees that empty homes need to be addressed and provide a wasted opportunity, not to mention issues relating to anti-social behaviour. The Council works closely with property owners to bring properties back into use. The vision document recognises that population and societal changes are influencing the type of housing need, for example, older people remaining in their homes, separating families etc.</p>	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				<p>3-Generation Homes</p> <p>Many of our older citizens live alone, and a significant proportion of those may later need to occupy Care Homes. It's possible that at least a sub-set of their children would be willing to share their home with their parent, if only their own accommodation was suitable. We could look to have some social family housing built with a downstairs bedroom, and this would release under-occupied homes for the wider community. Furthermore, (and possibly with the right incentives) this arrangement could also help delay the time when the elderly person becomes dependent on residential care.</p>	<p>The Council supports measures to enable more people to stay longer in their homes (addressed in aspiration 3, action c)</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>Singles Communities</p> <p>Many people live alone, possibly having separated from partners, and are in like circumstance with friends. There are numerous examples where single friends in groups of 4 or more have occupied suitable shared accommodation, efficiently sharing facilities and transport, and with some later expectation of mutual support should health issues arise. But obviously the supply of suitable residences is not high. Perhaps some self-build plots could be made available to such an audience. Such properties may have a number of ground floor bedrooms (or an elevator). Such premises might also later lend themselves to live-in carers. These are just some ideas to stimulate thoughts, but the important principle to stress is that</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council supports self build and has made reference to this in the concept statements as well as in action 1c</p>	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				<p>SEBC needs to:</p> <p>Not passively assume that average occupancy will inevitably continue to reduce average household size;</p> <p>Be more creative in driving solutions to a broader set of constituents than the nuclear family;</p> <p>Encourage housing solutions, which may delay the time when single people need to, call upon the state for Care services. This is a well-being issue as well as a housing issue.</p>	<p>The Council believes that creative and flexible solutions are needed to address current and future housing need.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood			The proposal for a Nursing home to be provided on a brownfield site within the Nowton Court complex should be included as a key site within the Nowton Court Continuing Care Retirement Community supporting care in the community and particularly for the residents of the urban area of Bury St Edmunds surrounded by Nowton Park. Based upon the answers to the questions above insufficient vision and provision has been provided for the elderly sector of the Borough for the Plan period where there needs to be allocations of specialist and related accommodation and where this provision is not generally part of the market housing or Affordable housing allocations identified by the Borough in its Plans. Given the size of the elderly sector the Borough should be working with the private sector in identifying appropriate allocations within the Plan.	It would not be appropriate within an aspiration in this document to allocate a specific site in the countryside outside of Bury St Edmunds for a particular form of development. Unless it is proposed to redevelop the existing buildings, further development within the site would not constitute brownfield development.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Retired people can, however, be a very valuable resource if they are willing to use some of their time to volunteer.' Who writes this rubbish - if I were retired I would be incensed by such comments. Most of this section seems to ignore those residents who work hard to pay for their own house, which alienates them from local government	Agree to amend this paragraph	Amend - paragraph 5.40 "There are many opportunities for retired people to undertake voluntary and charitable work which is recognised as making an important contribution to society, as well as the health and wellbeing of those participating.
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Action to bring empty homes back into use has largely failed, making the strategy just words, not backed by action.</p> <p>Again, the mantra about helping vulnerable people to stay in their own homes but nothing practical to achieve it. Where are the bungalows going to be built? Para 5.40 that refers to clusters of elderly people living on estates designed for families is offensive. Estates are, or should be, designed for people irrespective of age.</p> <p>If more bungalows were built instead of 'land efficient' 3-storey buildings, less adaption would be needed to keep the elderly in their own home. However, this wouldn't find favour with developers or planners who remain committed to urban cramming.</p>	The document sets out the councils aspirations to support efficient use of the existing housing stock and seeks to ensure that future developments address the issues that are likely to face communities in the future. The vision document allocates areas for large scale development throughout the document which should help address where houses and community infrastructure is to be built. A range of high quality development types are advocated within the document which supports the diversity and long term viability of development which are integrated with existing communities.	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	The provision of new accommodation for the elderly in specialist units such as Care Villages and Nursing homes can substantially assist the provision of downsizing for the elderly so that the vacated properties can be recycled to families at an earlier time than at present. That is why the Borough Council should be proactive in supporting the private sector in the provision of accommodation for the elderly and for new Care accommodation to assist and this is not specifically referred to in the section covered by this question.	Actions g and h under paragraph 5.42 recognise this. In particular, the reference to other partners in (h) includes private sector providers. Specific policies to assist in the identification of suitable sites are included in the draft development Management Policies document.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Yes and work with Havebury to ensure their properties do not stand empty for months when vacant, as they do now.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	We support the need for new communities to be designed for all and to be accessible and fully inclusive. However, we do not consider the plan needs to include policies to deliver Lifetime Homes as these are matters which should be left to the Building Regulations.	The actions under paragraph 5.42 are not planning policies, but corporate actions which may be achieved by any number of methods, including the Building Regulations. Should the Building Regulations fail to deliver to meet demand, alternatives may need to be explored. This issue is considered further in the draft Development Management Policies document.	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Apart from numbers proposed.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	Helping people to stay in their homes. This needs to be fully funded. It is not sufficient to only provide part care to very vulnerable people.	The Council has no control over the funding for people to stay in their homes but encourages this an action.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the commitment to meeting the specialist housing needs of older people, and we will continue to work with the borough council as per 5.42 h). We would suggest, however, that while the number of older people and number of older people with specialist housing needs is projected to increase significantly, older people are not the only group with specialist housing needs. That particular paragraph may be more effective if it referred to older 'and vulnerable' people and the same principle applies to all references to older people in this document. We are pleased to see reference to Lifetime Homes in this document, though (as we have suggested in responses to other consultations) it is perhaps better to include a strong policy on delivery of Lifetime Homes in development management policies.	The Council agrees that this section should also reflect the needs of vulnerable people. The draft Development Management Policies document does include a policy requiring new dwellings to be (inter alia) adaptable in terms of lifetime changes and use. Furthermore, the change to refer to vulnerable people as well as older people has also been made in the Development Management Policies document.	Action 5.42 h has been deleted as it repeats actions elsewhere. Reference has been made to older and vulnerable people in action c.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes, but with the qualifications given in b) below. The wording on page 37, item 5.40 of Vision stating 'Retired people can, however, be a very valuable resource if they are willing to use some of their time to volunteer' is rather patronising and should be removed from the document or re-worded.	Agree to amend this paragraph	Amend - paragraph 5.40 'There are many opportunities for retired people to undertake voluntary and charitable work which is recognised as making an important contribution to society, as well as the health and wellbeing of those participating.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	See above
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	Generally - but the problem of first time buyers trying to get on the housing ladder MUST be addressed.	The Council recognises that the cost of housing, and the general economic climate, makes it difficult for first time buyers to afford a home. The aspirations in this document aim to do as much as possible to provide flexible, affordable accommodation. However, we recognise that the wider economic conditions make accessing mortgages very difficult.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	There is a danger that building homes for elderly people will not allow sufficient off road parking spaces as it the case with the development of Thingoe House. This particular development will undoubtedly lead to excessive on road parking in adjoining residential roads such as Barwell Road to the detriment of existing residents	The Thingoe House development has not yet taken place, so it is too soon to assess its parking impact. It has to be acknowledged that many older people do still use cars, but the parking demands tend to be lower than that of family housing.	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Too crowded roads will not cope too ambitious	The impact of new development and the limitations of the existing infrastructure is addressed throughout the document. Any future development would be required to have had regard to the impacts that it would have on traffic flows and sustainable methods of transport are encouraged where feasible.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes	BUT is it really possible in these economic times.	The Council agrees that the current economic climate presents problems in terms of development and growth. However, the Vision plans for the next twenty years and must anticipate fluctuations in the economy.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Yes. Essential bearing in mind people are living longer and the current social climate and decline of marriage and more and more single people of various ages whether to buy or to rent.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	Mostly, but suggest more sheltered housing and more affordable, intermediate, and Low Cost Market housing	The document does take account of the need for sheltered housing. The amount of affordable housing provision is already set by Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 15: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	From past developments in the town I'm not sure aspirations means a lot in the end.	Noted	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebely			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	Would like to see an increased emphasis on reducing dependence on fossil fuels - promoting more "low carbon" and sustainable sources of energy in housing development.	The Council considers that this issue is addressed in aspiration 1 action i. It is also addressed in the Sustainability and Climate Change section (aspiration 2 and 3)	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper					no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	These issues will be dealt with at the time of any application for development	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	Each industrial unit should have sufficient on site parking space and not be allowed to park on roadways. There should be a road link between the business park and the southeast relief road	no		The parking requirements will be looked at as part of any application for development on the site. An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car.	An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car.
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Unwise to concentrate employment all on one site, which will inevitably involve commuting for many employees. Better to have several distributed sites, which at least provide the possibility of local work for local people			There are a number of established employment sites in the town, some of which have opportunities for further development and intensification of use	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	Each industrial unit should have sufficient on site parking space and no one should be allowed to park on roadways. Skyliner Way should be no parking on either side and parking should be provided for existing units. No Parking should be allowed on the relief road and for preference the road should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern boundary. A Park & Ride and/or Park and Share facility should be built accessed from the relief road which would provide for business use, football overflow, general town business and visits plus Christmas shopping. There should be a road link between the business park and the southeast relief road. Lorry access should be via the Rookery Crossroads junction and measures taken to ensure this is complied with.	no	The new school on Moreton Hall should be located away from the flight path and directly south of the football facility in an area currently designated as business park. Additional parking is required for the football facility and could form part of the school area or as above.	The parking requirements will meet any adopted standards at the time of a planning application. An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car. A road link between the south east and the relief road is neither feasible or viable.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	Society would encourage the Authority to maintain the same high quality of strategic landscaping as existing Suffolk Business Park. Planting should be implemented prior to construction. A common approach to the design of individual buildings should be encouraged to ensure a cohesive theme to the new Business Park.			The design and landscaping standards have been established in the adopted masterplan	No changes required
BVR15811	Malcolm Honour	MgMs Ltd	The Churchmanor Estate Co Plc and Rougham Estate	no	I am instructed by The Churchmanor Estates Co Plc and the Rougham Estate to respond to the consultation. As the Council will be aware, my clients are preparing proposals for the Suffolk Park extension including the Eastern Relief Road.	yes		The investigation of mineral resource is necessary to avoid the sterilisation of the area.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15811	Malcolm Honour	MgMs Ltd	The Churchmanor Estate Co Plc and Rougham Estate	no	My clients support the inclusion of the Suffolk Park extension as a strategic site. The wording of the draft policy largely reflects previously adopted policy and the boundary reflects our clients Masterplan. However, with regard to mineral resources, it is considered unlikely that prior extraction will be appropriate having regard to the need to design the road, the implications for land levels and impact on ground conditions. It is suggested therefore, that the reference to investigating the extent and quality of mineral resources should be deleted from this policy.				

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	Each industrial unit should have sufficient on site parking space and no one should be allowed to park on roadways. Skyliner Way should be no parking on either side and parking should be provided for existing units. No Parking should be allowed on the relief road and for preference the road should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern boundary. A Park & Ride and/or Park and Share facility should be built accessed from the relief road which would provide for business use, football overflow, general town business and visits plus Christmas shopping. There should be a road link between the business park and the southeast relief road. Lorry access should be via the Rookery Crossroads junction and measures taken to ensure this is complied with.	no	The new school on Moreton Hall should be located away from the flight path and directly south of the football facility in an area currently designated as business park. Additional parking is required for the football facility and could form part of the school area or as above.	The parking requirements will meet any adopted standards at the time of a planning application. . An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car. Restrictions on lorry movements would be unreasonable but the ease of access at the Rookery Cross Roads would mean this would be natural route for lorries to take when accessing the park.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	Taylor Wimpey as landowners of a significant part of the allocated area broadly support the content of policy BV13 and the intention to deliver high quality business opportunities in Use Classes B1 and B8 intended to meet the longer terms needs of the town (Vision 2031 paragraph 6.9). The acknowledgement that the site may not be fully delivered within the plan period is appropriate and therefore supported.	yes		Comments are noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		It is recognised that decisions have been taken in respect of the preferred alignment of the Relief Road, the granting of planning consent for the community football area and the Council's preferred location for the future secondary school provision. Vision 2031 refers at paragraph 6.10 to the possibility of workable sand and gravel reserves that will need to be fully investigated prior to planning permission for the development of the site, with a potential need for prior extraction. In addition, a part of the site may be effectively sterilised by the building height restrictions arising from the secondary runway approach for Rougham Airfield.			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Whilst we understand that this approach is rarely if ever used the height restrictions (CAA CAP168 Chapter 4 s2) still arise as indicated on the safeguarding plan and may affect the extent of land that can be developed.</p> <p>Given that the strategic significance of the allocation is acknowledged the issue is therefore to ensure that the site is genuinely available and deliverable. Taylor Wimpey believe that a balanced approach is needed, recognising that a significant part of the infrastructure needed to make the Business Park extension a viable proposition will need to be funded by the residential components of the overall scheme.</p>			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		Although prior implementation of the Relief Road is referred to in Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS14, these policies find their genesis pre recession and the justification for the prior implementation of the Relief Road has not yet been fully established. This work is being carried out, jointly with others (reflecting the comment at Vision 2031 paragraph 7.19) and Taylor Wimpey is committed to completing this assessment at the earliest possible opportunity. Moreover, the cost of implementing this infrastructure work is also the subject of on-going design work and has therefore not yet been fully assessed. It can however be expected to be substantial.			The relief road must be brought forward in accordance with Core Strategy policies CS11 and CS14.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		It is clear that any return on the capital cost of the infrastructure to deliver the Business Park extension will not be capable of being amortized by the employment land alone within a reasonable period. The cost of constructing the Eastern Relief Road will fall wholly upon the development of Moreton Hall and Taylor Wimpey will seek a balanced approach to infrastructure delivery across the whole area allocated to ensure that development is viable, reflecting the importance attached to the Suffolk Business Park extension (paragraph 6.10).			See above	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Policy must take into account the needs of residents who are commuters. There is likely to be a larger number of these. Many use car sharing schemes, but a move to rail is likely. As well as good access to the A14 (and solving the congestion problems), provision must be made at the railway station with much greater provision for car parking and cycle parking and much better access. See q 10.	yes		An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy to require a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car	An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy to require a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no				No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Park & ride on Airfield (Sow Lane End). Redesign roads to give lay-bys for parking without traffic interruption. Cycle paths within wooded areas. Abandon relief road with smaller industrial area to approx old airfield perimeter track still allowing HGVs access to Jcn 45 and lower cost to enable earlier start.	no		Recent research has established that the size of the town is not sufficient to support a park and ride. The employment area is required to meet the long term economic development needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson				We agree in principle with the long-term allocation of land for an extension of the business park, but we would direct you to our proposal for the health campus given its potential for the benefits described.			The health campus is located to the West of Bury St Edmunds which is the preferred location of the NHS Trust.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the allocation of employment land to extend Suffolk Business Park. This is a strong commercial location on the A14 with potential for logistics and high quality office space.</p> <p>We agree with the importance of access to this site in terms of public transport as well as the extension and delivery of new pedestrian and cycle routes via Skyliner Way, the planning of the Moreton Hall extension and the new Eastern Relief Road.</p>			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	We agree with long term, large scale strategic allocations of employment land to enable new, high quality premises to meet modern occupier requirements, provide for business relocation and redevelopment of existing premises that are no longer fit for purpose in order to attract new investment and create new employment opportunities.				
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			We support the allocation of this strategic site for employment use noting that this is a long term allocation. We are, however, concerned to see the completion of the relief road linking Bedingfeld Way with the 14 Rookery Crossroads at an early date in order to relieve traffic problems on the existing A14 junctions.			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Reduce the size of the industrial area plan by abandoning relief road and allowing industrial traffic to find its own way to junction 45.	no	Future requirements could allow expansion north.	The business park cannot proceed without the relief road as the additional traffic generated would have an adverse impact	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	This site makes an ideal location for Health Campus. Direct access of A14, next to Rougham Airfield for siting of helipad. Site would mean minimal noise and light pollution to residential development. Site large enough to provide supportive business and expansion if required.			The health campus is located to the West of Bury St Edmunds which is the preferred location of the NHS Trust.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	Each industrial unit should have sufficient on site parking space and no one should be allowed to park on roadways. Skyliner Way should be no parking on either side and parking should be provided for existing units. It is already dangerous here and many accidents have been caused. This has been primarily generated by Royal Mail, Fortress Group not having sufficient parking for Customers or employees. No Parking should be allowed on the proposed relief road and for preference the road should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern boundary. Skyliner way should not be the link to the relief road but Kempson Way would make a better link. This keeps traffic away from residential areas, reducing noise impacts and pollution in residential areas.	no	The new school on Moreton Hall could be located away from the flight path and directly south of the football facility in an area currently designated as business park. Additional parking is required for the football facility and could form part of the school area or as above.	The parking requirements will meet any adopted standards at the time of a planning application. An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car. The business park will meet the long term employment land needs of the borough	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	No requirement for extension of this area until all existing units, many of which are empty, are taken up by businesses. Any additional traffic to this industrial area should be directed to the A14 via new access / exit in both directions, thus ensuring all commercial traffic does not enter town on already congested routes			see above	no changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The Masterplan must cater for all the likely modes of transport in addition to the mandatory requirements of the Core Strategy. This should not discount a railway siding north of Rougham Airfield when the Station Hill site is redeveloped and HGV direct links to the Rookery interchange on A14. The road route to the business park must be structured off the A14	no opinion		An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy to require a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>The so-called 'relief road' is supposed to be linked solely to Suffolk Business Park and not to additional housing. Any commercial benefit from the road will be offset by the development proposals at the Rookery junction.</p> <p>The proposed over-development, including a hotel, is wrong. The junction also needs improving now.</p> <p>The 'relief road' is routed too close to the Grade 2 listed Rougham Airfield tower and will compromise the site</p>			The route of the relief road is established in the adopted masterplan and must be completed and available for use in accordance with Core Strategy policies CS11 and CS14.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Legal obligations for roads etc to be carried out before units built, otherwise they will not get done.	yes		The policy relates to the Suffolk Business Park and the eastern relief road is required before this can commence	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	But again infrastructure needs improving. All units should have totally adequate car parking space (on site). Do not think the proposed relief/link road will be of much use. Wrong site, wrong direction.	no		Car parking on the site will meet the adopted standards at the time.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	The A14 relief road will cause a rat run for HGVs through the Moreton Hall area. Such traffic should be restricted to the A14 to the Business Park only.	no	The A14 relief road will cause a rat run for HGVs through the Moreton Hall area. Such traffic should be restricted to the A14 to the Business Park only.	Restrictions on lorry movements would be unreasonable but the ease of access at the Rookery Cross Roads would mean this would be natural route for lorries to take when accessing the park	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the requirement for an investigation into the extent and quality of the mineral resource at this site. Given the size of this site, the transport implications will be significant and robust transport assessment and travel planning will be of vital importance.			An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy to require a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car	An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy to require a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society is supportive of increased local employment opportunities. Whilst no objections are raised to this allocation, the Society believes that new employment sites need to be pepper-potted across the town to reduce work related trips and to increase urban vitality. Greater emphasis needs to be given to mixed uses in all of the agreed directions of growth for the town. The take up of the employment sites should be used to provide a policy trigger for the release of new homes.			There are a number of established employment sites in the town, some of which have opportunities for further development and intensification of use	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). In general, the use of the site should generally be limited to the Town's requirements for jobs. Expansion that goes beyond this will just provide jobs for people who do not live in the Borough and thus encourage many of them to move to the Town placing pressure on housing and the infrastructure. The Census of 2001 indicated that significant levels of the community were employed in the Town from outside the Borough. The very high number of vehicles heading to and from the A14 in the morning and evening, seems to confirm this position.	no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process.						See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						See above	no changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			yes	Each industrial unit / factory / office should have ample parking and should NOT be allowed to park on the road as per Lady Miriam Way ... Brown field Industrial area to be identified & used first (infill / redeveloped) More provision for housing to decrease density on Mount Road !Newer Entrance to Bury St Edmunds. (The excess land is available)			Car parking on the site will meet the adopted standards at the time. There are a range of employment sites across the sites to meet different needs and it would be inappropriate to constrain economic growth by allowing only brownfield sites to come forward.	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		yes	Access road and parking must be looked at properly - not ignored as on Moreton Hall and boded as at Nowton Park. Employ some good engineers with a bit of experience.	Car parking on the site will meet the adopted standards at the time.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This is crop land, which is valuable for production of food, fuel and material. There are several empty and unused business sites in and around Bury at present (see local press)	no	Boundary intrudes on neighbouring Rougham. Moreton Hall business estate has already extended far enough to the east and should not go any further.	The site will provide for the long term employment needs of the town which needs to be balanced against the loss of agricultural land	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Many empty commercial properties in town centre no need to encroach on green site	no opinion		There are a range of employment sites across the town to meet different needs but these do not meet the long term economic growth needs of the borough.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no	if all the empty shops, offices & business premises at present empty, then new areas could be developed.	no opinion		There are a range of employment sites across the town to meet different needs but these do not meet the long term economic growth needs of the borough.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	It is important that this is brought on line as soon as possible and the relief road constructed or the policy changed so the road can go hand in hand with development Compared with Haverhill Bury is stagnating in terms of new development	no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes			Each industrial unit should have sufficient parking. No parking on the relief road which should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern Boundary. A link road is needed between the business park and the south east relief road and all lorry access should be via Rookery Junction	Car parking on the site will meet the adopted standards at the time.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	Access to low rent units. Who will use them What new employers will use them	no opinion		The site will provide for the long term employment needs of the town	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes	INCREASED PARKING SO THE BUSINESS DO NOT BLOCK ROADS AS THEY CURRENTLY DO			Car parking on the site will meet the adopted standards at the time.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	Each industrial unit should have sufficient on site parking space and no one should be allowed to park on roadways. Skyliner Way should be no parking on either side and parking should be provided for existing units. No Parking should be allowed on the relief road and for preference the road should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern boundary. A Park & Ride and/or Park and Share facility should be built accessed from the relief road which would provide for business use, football overflow, general town business and visits plus Christmas shopping. There should be a road link between the business park and the southeast relief road. Lorry access should be via the Rookery Crossroads junction and measures taken to ensure this is complied with.		The new school on Moreton Hall should be located away from the flight path and directly south of the football facility in an area currently designated as business park. Additional parking is required for the football facility and could form part of the school area or as above.	The parking requirements will meet any adopted standards at the time of a planning application. . An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car. Recent work has demonstrated that the town is not currently capable of supporting a park and ride site. Restrictions on lorry movements would be unreasonable but the ease of access at the Rookery Cross Roads would mean this would be natural route for lorries to take when accessing the park.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes	Proper internal relief road not a 20mph restricted route	This will be a matter for county highways to determine	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	<p>There MUST be sufficient on site parking space for each industrial unit and no one should be allowed to park on roadways. Skyliner Way should be no parking on either side and parking should be provided for existing units. No Parking should be allowed on the relief road and the road should go through the Business Park and not on the Northern boundary. A Park & Ride and/or Park and Share facility should be built accessed from the relief road which would provide for business use, football overflow, general town business and visits plus Christmas shopping.</p> <p>There should be a road link between the business park and the southeast relief road.</p>	no	The new school on Moreton Hall should be away from the flight path and directly south of the football facility. Additional parking is required for the football facility and could form part of the school area.	The parking requirements will meet any adopted standards at the time of a planning application. . An additional paragraph has been inserted in the policy referring to the need for a travel plan to reduce dependency on the private car. Recent work has demonstrated that the town is not currently capable of supporting a park and ride site. Restrictions on lorry movements would be unreasonable but the ease of access at the Rookery Cross Roads would mean this would be natural route for lorries to take when accessing the park	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Carol Eagles				Lorry access should be via the upgraded Rookery Crossroads junction and measures taken to ensure this is complied with. Additional parking spaces should be provided at the Retail Park.			Restrictions on lorry movements would be unreasonable but the ease of access at the Rookery Cross Roads would mean this would be natural route for lorries to take when accessing the park.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Infill at other BROWN FIELD INDUSTRIAL. eg Blenheim Way, Risby etc	yes		There are a range of employment sites across the town to meet different needs but these do not meet the long term economic growth needs of the borough.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I do not agree 6.a) or 6e). Both of these will ruin the historic charm of Bury. I do however agree with the statement under the heading BV13 on page 41 of Vision 2031.	yes		The support for the policy is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	The RELIEF road is a FIRST PRIORITY and use reserve funds to establish and allow developer to repay with development	yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			yes		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 16: Extension to Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds (BV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV13?	Question 16b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 16c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 16d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes	My only point here would be to hold up before you the example of your "public service village" (point 6.16) which was and is a folie de grandeur if there ever was one. Perhaps St. Edmundsbury could concentrate on doing useful things for residents instead of trying to appear more significant an organisation than it is?	yes		The first phase of the public service village has been completed and the council is keen to see the remainder of the site developed in accordance with the adopted 2007 masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper					no	No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	These issues will be dealt with at the time of any application for development	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		no	As you make clear in paragraph 6.15, the development of Suffolk Business Park offers an opportunity to relocate employment uses to another site and I would prefer it if you actively encouraged the regeneration of some of these employment areas for other uses. Surely it is possible to do this by saying that you would not give permission for future industrial development there.	The employment sites are allocated to meet the economic needs of industry and business in the town.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	There should not be a reliance on the Cambridge corridor for jobs. Bury St Edmunds is not the only town expanding and using Cambridge as a jobs haven. How many other expanding towns are using Bury St Edmunds as employment avenues. i.e. Thetford	yes		The Suffolk Business Park is allocated to meet the long term employment needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR15912	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP	no	1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 This representation is an objection to Policies BV14 and BV15 of the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 Preferred Options AAP document and the associated supporting text. Our objection relates specifically to land at Western Way, to the west of Beetons Way, which is currently allocated in part as a 'redevelopment opportunity' by virtue of saved Policy BSE17 of the St Edmundsbury Local Plan.	no		Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on the 27th March 2012 sets out a number of core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-making. Amongst these are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value • Promote mixed use developments and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban areas • Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable 			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.2 It goes on to state in paragraph 19 that 'Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system' and in paragraph 20 that 'To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century'. Finally, paragraph 22 states: 'Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable communities'			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>East of England Plan</p> <p>2.3 The East of England Plan was approved by the Secretary of State in May 2008 and provides the top tier of the statutory development plan and with which LDF prepared by LPA are required to generally conform. Whilst the Coalition Government has stated its intention to abolish RSS and has secured the powers to do so through the Localism Act which obtained Royal Assent in November 2011, the Secretary of State has given no indication as to how and when he will exercise his powers to secure abolition.</p> <p>2.4 The overall spatial strategy for the region is 'to concentrate development at the Region's cities and other significant urban areas including selected market towns. They provide its focal points for retailing and other commercial activities, administration, culture and tourism.' Bury St Edmunds is consequently identified as a 'Key Centre for Development and Change' in Policy SS3.</p>			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.5 Policy E1 subsequently sets targets for job growth over the plan period to 2021, to be tested through LDF preparation by LPA. St Edmundsbury falls within the area defined as the 'Rest of Suffolk' in Policy E1 alongside Forest Heath and Mid Suffolk. The job growth target for the sub-area is 18,000.</p> <p>2.6 Policy E2 then requires LPA in the preparation of LDF and informed through appropriate studies to 'ensure that an adequate range of sites/premises (including sites within mixed use areas and town/district centres) is allocated to accommodate the full range of sectoral requirements to achieve the indicative job growth targets of Policy E1.' Subsequently the supporting text notes that 'Surplus employment land may be released for housing or other pressing development needs in line with PPS3. However, it will be important to base such decisions on sound evidence. Land that is likely to be needed for employment should be safeguarded against other development pressures'.</p>			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.7 Policy E3 then goes on to state that LPA in the preparation of LDF should 'identify readily serviceable strategic employment sites of the quality and quantity required to meet the needs of business identified through the employment land reviews identified in Policy E2'.</p> <p>2.8 Bury St Edmunds' identification as a Key Centre for Development and Change is addressed in Policy BSE1. This policy states that: 'Provision should be made for further employment, service and housing development that reflects the role of Bury St Edmunds as an important service centre between Cambridge and Ipswich. Employment growth should be of a scale to minimise the volume of long distance out-commuting from the town. Priority will be given to the development of vacant and underused land that respects and enhances the historic town centre. Development and transport strategies should promote a shift to non-car modes of travel' (Our underlining) Core Strategy DPD</p>			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.9 The AAP is being prepared to accord with the Core Strategy DPD. The Core Strategy DPD was statutorily adopted by the Council in December 2010. Policy CS9 'Employment and the Local Economy' states in part that 'Provision will be made for development that will aim to deliver at least 13,000 new jobs in the Borough by 2026' The policy goes on to note that a Strategic Employment Area (SEA) identified on land to the east of the existing Suffolk Business Park will continue to be allocated and that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment growth will also be achieved by the allocation of land for employment in mixed use developments; and that, • Existing general employment areas will continue to be protected and promoted for employment uses 			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.10 In preparing the Core Strategy, the LPA collated a substantial evidence base which included the West Suffolk Employment Land Review 2009 undertaken by Grimley. It is worth noting paragraph 7.46: 'Given the projected oversupply of employment land in the Borough outlined in Table 108 there is clearly a need to manage the process of bringing forward new employment land in the Borough to ensure the right balance of employment land and land for other uses. We therefore recommend that St Edmundsbury Borough Council consider a phased approach that would consider losing some of the existing poorer quality employment sites in Bury St Edmunds as high quality parcels of land become available at Suffolk Business Park.' (Our underlining)			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.11 The Employment Land Review then goes on to state at paragraph 7.48 that: Employment land development on the scale proposed at Suffolk Business Park has to be carefully implemented to ensure the right balance of employment land is maintained within the Borough. It is clear that not all of the employment land in Bury St Edmunds will be needed throughout the planning period given the balance set out in Table 108. We therefore recommend that St Edmundsbury Borough Council carry out a detailed study to identify those employment locations that are of poorer quality in Bury St Edmunds and provide a strategy for phasing these out of employment and into other uses in conjunction with the developments at the Suffolk Business Park Extension.' (Our underlining)			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.12 These recommendations are reflected in the adopted Core Strategy DPD insofar as it states at paragraph 4.109 that: 'The development of 68.28 hectares of allocated employment land to the east of the Suffolk Business Park in Bury St Edmunds - will secure an eastern relief road with direct access from the A14 and a supply of quality, well serviced sites well located within the borough and the region. This strategic site allocation will provide long term certainty and enable the town to respond to changes in demand. It will also allow the opportunity and flexibility for older inappropriately located and/or poor quality employment sites within the town to be regenerated and/or re-used for other purposes (i.e. businesses that may not fit neatly into the B Use Classes). This will be addressed in more detail in the Bury St Edmunds Area Action Plan.' (Our underlining)			Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>Representation</p> <p>2.13 Our representation is an objection to the proposed 'reallocation' of the Policy BSE17 land to the west of Beetons Way as a 'General Employment Area' suitable only for development falling within Classes B1, B2 and B8 of the Town & Country (Uses Classes) Order 1987 as amended. We acknowledge that Policy BV15 provides for some flexibility in respect of 'alternative uses', but would argue that in combination with Policy 28 of the draft Development Management Policies DPD and its supporting text, this 'flexibility' is extremely limited. This issue is addressed in further detail below.</p>			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.14 The written justification for Policy BSE17 notes that 'The site is next to Borough Council land and premises on the Western Way General Employment Area, parts of which are underused and current operations could be re-arranged to make better use of the site' The Council subsequently brought forward a Public Service Village (PSV) Masterplan which was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance in January 2007. The masterplan brought forward proposals for the redevelopment of the entire BSE17 Policy Area west of Beetons way, excluding the NHS Logistics warehousing facility off Olding Road. Three phases of development were proposed, commencing with the provision of West Suffolk House and a large area of surface level car parking off Olding Road as Phase 1. Only phase 1 has been completed to date.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.15 The land west of Beetons Way that is allocated by virtue of Policy BSE17 remains, in our submission, very ineffectively used. In part it comprises a substantial 1960's built warehousing unit occupied by NHS Logistics. This provides approximately 6,930 sq.m of B8 floorspace with approximately 573 sq.m of ancillary B1 office floorspace on 1.35 ha of land. Physically adjoining the building is a Council depot, beyond which lies a skate park; opposite the building are Olding Road and the Council car park. These uses occupy a further 2.75 ha of land.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.16 Passing reference is made to the PSV in paragraph 6.16 of the PO AAP and we would acknowledge that as the PSV was envisaged to primarily constitute B1 office uses, it would accord with the provisions of Policy BV14. However, we are also conscious that in large part, the physical site circumstances that led to designation of the site as a 'redevelopment opportunity' remain, i.e. that parts of the site are underused and current operations could be re-arranged to make better use of the site. In current circumstances and given pressures to drive down public expenditure, there is little prospect of the PSV being realised.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.17 In terms of 'alternative business development' the Council might point to paragraph 6.19 of the draft AAP and Policy BV15. However, this policy has to be read alongside the draft DM DPD Policy 28 and its supporting text, paragraph 6.2. Paragraph 6.2 rightly notes the Government's position in the then emerging NPPF, but then goes on to justify a 'blanket' policy for the protection of land in any form of employment use, allocated or not, from any alternative use or redevelopment that does not meet the criterion set out in Policy 28. Indeed, the policy may be interpreted as stating that a change from one form of employment use to another, which resulted in a reduced level of employment generation, would be unacceptable.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.18 The justification for the approach set out in the policy is little more than an expressed fear that without it, the respective LPA might not meet the employment objectives set out in the Core Strategy DPD. The Policy as worded is, in our submission, insufficiently precise and consequently open to wide interpretation. Furthermore it implies a level of evidence in the submission of a planning application that for many applicants would be unnecessarily burdensome or beyond their control, contrary to advice contained in paragraph 21 of the NPPF.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.19 The planning policy consequence, in our view, of Policies BV14 and BV15, will be to further constrain opportunities for redevelopment. The correct response, in response to the NPPF, the East of England Plan and the commitments made in the adopted Core Strategy in the light of the evidence base, is to properly explore the opportunity presented for redevelopment of the site and bring forward a policy framework to reflect this. This examination is conspicuous by its absence.</p> <p>2.20 In our submission there remains an opportunity to ensure a much more effective use of the land through the promotion of a mixed use redevelopment. Accompanying this representation are three concept drawings illustrating how the former Policy BSE17 site west of Beetons Way might be redeveloped in whole or in part for mixed use purposes that will achieve the effective use of previously developed land, thereby contributing towards the delivery of sustainable communities.</p>			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.21 We would wish to see the AAP amended to include a policy and suitable written justification worded as follows: 'Land at Beetons Way and Western Way was previously identified in Policy BSE17 of the Local Plan as a redevelopment opportunity. Whilst this has in part been secured through the development of West Suffolk House, the Council recognises that the remainder of the land formally identified west of Beetons way continues to be underutilised and ineffectively used. In reflection of Govt. guidance, the East of England Plan and the Council's adopted Core Strategy and its associated evidence base, the Council will continue to identify the land as a suitable redevelopment opportunity and will apply the following policy in the consideration of any scheme that may come forward.			See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		LAND WEST OF BEETONS WAY AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP IS IDENTIFIED AS A REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY AREA. THE COUNCIL WILL ENCOURAGE A MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE TO ACCOMMODATE SUITABLE USES, WHICH MAY INCLUDE BUT SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED TO LAND FOR HOUSING (INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING), LEISURE, COMMERCIAL, TRADE COUNTER OR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES. ANY SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE COUNCIL'S EXISTING DEPOT AND THE SKATE PARK CAN BE SUITABLY RELOCATED. DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LED THROUGH PREPARATION OF A CONCEPT MASTERPLAN.			Additional text has been added to Policy BV15 in the revised document to ensure that any proposals seek to maximise economic growth and do not generate any conflict with existing uses. It will for any planning application on this site to justify the uses being proposed in accordance with the policy.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	The historic market and town centre shops. However, these proposals are all weighted in favour of the retention of the Arc/Cattlemarket development which the Council were persuaded to impose on the town by developer Centros who then left the scheme 11 months after it opened.	no	The Arc/Cattlemarket development needs to be scrapped and a need policy developed to meet location needs and based upon environmentally sustainable principles	The area referred to is established and is included within the town centre boundary.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		no	Existing employment areas deemed `old` should be redeveloped to make them fit for purpose. The answer is not to move all such sites into new units on the Eastern side of town.	This is covered under Policy BV15	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Explain why Suffolk Business Park and Moreton Hall are both included. The general employment area to the east is Suffolk Business Park, not Moreton Hall which is residential. Remove Class B2 and B8 from Moreton Hall.</p> <p>Remove Class B8 from SBP until the impact of development is known.</p> <p>The area does not need even more storage and warehousing because of the traffic generation.</p>	no	<p>The policy must include measures to prevent inappropriate change of use at sites adjacent to dwellings. The decision on whether a change of use is appropriate to be determined by the community not the council.</p>	<p>These are existing employment areas with established uses. The use classes are established and appropriate for the sites.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		Insufficient consideration has been given to the provision of new accommodation and specialist accommodation / facilities for the elderly where the jobs created by this development will substantially assist the range of employment and jobs for the Borough. For instance the provision of Nursing homes provides substantial new employment in a number of the job categories apart from assisting provision in secondary and tertiary job provision through supporting services. Job provision in the elderly sector is well researched and the information readily accessed to show this substantial benefit.			These facilities can come forward as individual planning applications and do not need to be allocated in a development plan.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	What about the shops and offices in and off the town centre?	yes		Offices and shops within the town centre are subject to policies contained in the Joint Development Management document	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Subject to transport assessment, the county council has no objection, in principle, to development at these locations but sites c), e), h), i), m) and n) will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.			The comments are noted	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	The Society welcomes the re-use of previously developed land to promote employment opportunities.			The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	no opinion		yes	We welcome the continued designation of the British Sugar factory site as a General Employment Area (GEA) (referenced 'd' under Policy BV14) and support the inclusion of the northern half of the factory site within the GEA, as identified on the draft Proposals Map. As detailed above, the NE and NW parts of British Sugar's demise are integral to the industrial operation and process of the factory. Accordingly, the extent of the GEA should be extended to include these areas, in order that they are safeguarded and protected for the continued operation of the British Sugar factory (and employment uses, in those terms). We suggest that the heading of the General Employment Area section starting	Agree that heading should be amended to 'General Employment Areas'	Amend heading to 'General Employment Areas'

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process.		yes	but with qualifications given below in d).	yes	Yes with the qualifications given in d). In general, the use of the site should generally be limited to the Town's requirements for jobs. Expansion that goes beyond this will just provide jobs for people who do not live in the Borough and thus encourage many of them to move to the Town placing pressure on housing and the infrastructure.	St Edmundsbury has been identified as a growth area and government funding has been allocated to help develop infrastructure. It is important to obtain the right balance between jobs and homes and that economic growth does not spoil the environment. There continues to be a need to provide a wide range of jobs in the town to ensure the local economy is able to expand.	Additional para to reflect the statement added in jobs and economy section

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Shultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document. (See					The Census of 2001 indicated that significant levels of the community were employed in the Town from outside the Borough. The very high number of vehicles heading to and from the A14 in the morning and evening seems to confirm this position.	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	No	yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short				Small business sites near/among homes should be preserved/encouraged and not moved out to margins of Bury (and replaced by more homes). People need local employment sites they can walk to.			The Council supports this approach through the designation of mixed use development areas.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes		no	Do not trust council or developers to provide enough roads parking & open spaces	These issues will be dealt with at the time of any application for development	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		no	Mostly agree but don't waste useful parking space on excessive landscaping. For example Skyliner Way.	Landscaping is an essential part of any planning scheme which is established at the planning application stage.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Not every parcel of land in the list of general employment areas is available for development. Some areas are owned by companies for expansion and some need infrastructure put in.	yes		The amount of developable land available for development is set out in Policy BV14.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		no opinion		The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 17: General Employment Areas Bury St Edmunds (BV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with the list of general employment areas?	Question 17b - Are there other general employment areas that should be safeguarded?	Question 17c - Do you agree with the proposals in the policy?	Question 17d - If not, please tell us why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	Why is the Rougham Industrial Estate being considered in Bury Vision 2031 when it is outside of the current BSE settlement boundary? Other smaller industrial areas in adjacent villages are not included even though they are just as close to central BSE, e.g. Park Farm.	no	What exactly is "high technology" and why would these businesses be given apparent preference over, say, a bakery?	The housing settlement boundary defines the extent of housing in the town and some of the employment sites fall outside of this boundary. The Rural Vision sets out those rural employment sites to meet the needs of the rural areas.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes				The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	As you make clear in paragraph 6.15, the development of Suffolk Business Park offers an opportunity to relocate employment uses to another site and I would prefer it if you actively encouraged the regeneration of some of these employment areas for other uses. Surely it is possible to do this by saying that you would not give permission for future industrial development there.	The employment sites are allocated to meet the economic needs of industry and business in the town.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15912	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP	no	<p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 This representation is an objection to Policies BV14 and BV15 of the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 Preferred Options AAP document and the associated supporting text. Our objection relates specifically to land at Western Way, to the west of Beeton's Way, which is currently allocated in part as a 'redevelopment opportunity' by virtue of saved Policy BSE17 of the St Edmundsbury Local Plan.</p> <p>2. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT National Planning Policy Framework 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on the 27th March 2012 sets out a number of core planning principles that should underpin both planmaking and decision making. Amongst these are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value 	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote mixed use developments and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban areas • Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable <p>2.2 It goes on to state in paragraph 19 that 'Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system' and in paragraph 20 that 'To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century'. Finally, paragraph 22 states: 'Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable communities'</p> <p>East of England Plan 2.3 The East of England Plan was approved by the Secretary of State in May 2008 and provides the top tier of the statutory development plan and with which LDF prepared by LPA are required to generally conform. Whilst the Coalition Government has stated its intention to abolish RSS and has secured the powers to do so through the Localism Act which obtained Royal Assent in November 2011, the Secretary of State has given no indication as to how and when he will exercise his powers to secure abolition.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.4 The overall spatial strategy for the region is ‘... to concentrate development at the region’s cities and other significant urban areas including selected market towns. They provide its focal points for retailing and other commercial activities, administration, culture and tourism.’ Bury St Edmunds is consequently identified as a ‘Key Centre for Development and Change’ in Policy SS3.</p> <p>2.5 Policy E1 subsequently sets targets for job growth over the plan period to 2021, to be tested through LDF preparation by LPA. St Edmundsbury falls within the area defined as the ‘Rest of Suffolk’ in Policy E1 alongside Forest Heath and Mid Suffolk. The job growth target for the subarea is 18,000.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.6 Policy E2 then requires LPA in the preparation of LDF and informed through appropriate studies to ‘... ensure that an adequate range of sites/premises (including sites within mixed use areas and town/district centres) is allocated to accommodate the full range of sectoral requirements to achieve the indicative job growth targets of Policy E1.’ Subsequently the supporting text notes that ‘Surplus employment land may be released for housing or other pressing development needs in line with PPS3. However, it will be important to base such decisions on sound evidence. Land that is likely to be needed for employment should be safeguarded against other development pressures’.</p> <p>2.7 Policy E3 then goes on to state that LPA in the preparation of LDF should ‘... identify readily serviceable strategic employment sites of the quality and quantity required to meet the needs of business identified through the employment land reviews identified in Policy E2’.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.8 Bury St Edmunds' identification as a Key Centre for Development and Change is addressed in Policy BSE1. This policy states that: 'Provision should be made for further employment, service and housing development that reflects the role of Bury St Edmunds as an important service centre between Cambridge and Ipswich. Employment growth should be of a scale to minimise the volume of long distance outcommuting from the town. Priority will be given to the development of vacant and underused land that respects and enhances the historic town centre. Development and transport strategies should promote a shift to non-car modes of travel' (Our underlining)	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>Core Strategy DPD 2.9 The AAP is being prepared to accord with the Core Strategy DPD. The Core Strategy DPD was statutorily adopted by the Council in December 2010. Policy CS9 'Employment and the Local Economy' states in part that 'Provision will be made for development that will aim to deliver at least 13,000 new jobs in the Borough by 2026...' The policy goes on to note that a Strategic Employment Area (SEA) identified on land to the east of the existing Suffolk Business Park will continue to be allocated and that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment growth will also be achieve by the allocation of land for employment in mixed use developments; and that, • Existing general employment areas will continue to be protected and promoted for employment uses. 	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.10 In preparing the Core Strategy, the LPA collated a substantial evidence base which included the West Suffolk Employment Land Review 2009 undertaken by Grimley. It is worth noting paragraph 7.46: 'Given the projected oversupply of employment land in the Borough outlined in Table 108 there is clearly a need to manage the process of bringing forward new employment land in the Borough to ensure the right balance of employment land and land for other uses. We therefore recommend that St Edmundsbury Borough Council consider a phased approach that would consider losing some of the existing poorer quality employment sites in Bury St Edmunds as high quality parcels of land become available at Suffolk Business Park.' (Our underlining)	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.11 The Employment Land Review then goes on to state at paragraph 7.48 that: 'Employment land development on the scale proposed at Suffolk Business Park has to be carefully implemented to ensure the right balance of employment land is maintained within the Borough. It is clear that not all of the employment land in Bury St Edmunds will be needed throughout the planning period given the balance set out in Table 108. We therefore recommend that St Edmundsbury Borough Council carry out a detailed study to identify those employment locations that are of poorer quality in Bury St Edmunds and provide a strategy for phasing these out of employment and into other uses in conjunction with the developments at the Suffolk Business Park Extension.' (Our underlining)	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.12 These recommendations are reflected in the adopted Core Strategy DPD insofar as it states at paragraph 4.109 that: 'The development of 68.28 hectares of allocated employment land to the east of the Suffolk Business Park in Bury St Edmunds ... will secure an eastern relief road with direct access from the A14 and a supply of quality, well serviced sites well located within the borough and the region. This strategic site allocation will provide longterm certainty and enable the town to respond to changes in demand. It will also allow the opportunity and flexibility for older inappropriately located and/or poor quality employment sites within the town to be regenerated and/or reused for other purposes (i.e. businesses that may not fit neatly into the B Use Classes). This will be addressed in more detail in the Bury St Edmunds Area Action Plan.' (Our underlining)	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>Representation</p> <p>2.13 Our representation is an objection to the proposed 'reallocation' of the Policy BSE17 land to the west of Beeton's Way as a 'General Employment Area' suitable only for development falling within Classes B1, B2 and B8 of the Town & Country (Uses Classes) Order 1987 as amended. We acknowledge that Policy BV15 provides for some flexibility in respect of 'alternative uses', but would argue that in combination with Policy 28 of the draft Development Management Policies DPD and its supporting text, this 'flexibility' is extremely limited. This issue is addressed in further detail below.</p> <p>2.14 The written justification for Policy BSE17 notes that 'The site is next to Borough Council land and premises on the Western Way General Employment Area, parts of which are underused and current operations could be rearranged to make better use of the site...' The Council subsequently brought forward a Public Service Village (PSV) Masterplan which was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance in January 2007.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>The masterplan brought forward proposals for the redevelopment of the entire BSE17 Policy Area west of Bretons way, excluding the NMS Logistics warehousing facility off Olding Road. Three phases of development were proposed, commencing with the provision of West Suffolk House and a large area of surface level car parking off Olding Road as Phase 1. Only phase 1 has been completed to date.</p> <p>2.15 The land west of Beetons Way that is allocated by virtue of Policy BSE17 remains, in our submission, very ineffectively used. In part it comprises a substantial 1960's built warehousing unit occupied by NHS Logistics. This provides approximately 6,930 sq.m of B8 floorspace with approximately 573 sq.m of ancillary B1 office floorspace on 1.35 ha of land. Physically adjoining the building is a Council depot, beyond which lies a skate park; opposite the building are Olding Road and the Council car park. These uses occupy a further 2.75 ha of land.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.16 Passing reference is made to the PSV in paragraph 6.16 of the PO AAP and we would acknowledge that as the PSV was envisaged to primarily constitute B1 office uses, it would accord with the provisions of Policy BV14. However, we are also conscious that in large part, the physical site circumstances that led to designation of the site as a 'redevelopment opportunity' remain, i.e. that parts of the site are underused and current operations could be rearranged to make better use of the site. In current circumstances and given pressures to drive down public expenditure, there is little prospect of the PSV being realised.	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.17 In terms of 'alternative business development' the Council might point to paragraph 6.19 of the draft AAP and Policy BV15. However, this policy has to be read alongside the draft DM DPD Policy 28 and its supporting text, paragraph 6.2. Paragraph 6.2 rightly notes the Government's position in the then emerging NPPF, but then goes on to justify a 'blanket' policy for the protection of land in any form of employment use, allocated or not, from any alternative use or redevelopment that does not meet the criterion set out in Policy 28. Indeed, the policy may be interpreted as stating that a change from one form of employment use to another, which resulted in a reduced level of employment generation, would be unacceptable.	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		<p>2.18 The justification for the approach set out in the policy is little more than an expressed fear that without it, the respective LPA might not meet the employment objectives set out in the Core Strategy DPD. The Policy as worded is, in our submission, insufficiently precise and consequently open to wide interpretation. Furthermore it implies a level of evidence in the submission of a planning application that for many applicants would be unnecessarily burdensome or beyond their control, contrary to advice contained in paragraph 21 of the NPPF.</p> <p>2.19 The planning policy consequence, in our view, of Policies BV14 and BV15, will be to further constrain opportunities for redevelopment. The correct response, in response to the NPPF, the East of England Plan and the commitments made in the adopted Core Strategy in the light of the evidence base, is to properly explore the opportunity presented for redevelopment of the site and bring forward a policy framework to reflect this. This examination is conspicuous</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.20 In our submission there remains an opportunity to ensure a much more effective use of the land through the promotion of a mixed use redevelopment. Accompanying this representation are three concept drawings illustrating how the former Policy BSE17 site west of Beetons Way might be redeveloped in whole or in part for mixed use purposes that will achieve the effective use of previously developed land, thereby contributing towards the delivery of sustainable communities.	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januaries	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		2.21 We would wish to see the AAP amended to include a policy and suitable written justification worded as follows: 'Land at Beetons Way and Western Way was previously identified in Policy BSE17 of the Local Plan as a redevelopment opportunity. Whilst this has in part been secured through the development of West Suffolk House, the Council recognises that the remainder of the land formally identified west of Beetons way continues to be underutilised and ineffectively used. In reflection of Govt. guidance, the East of England Plan and the Council's adopted Core Strategy and its associated evidence base, the Council will continue to identify the land as a suitable redevelopment opportunity and will apply the following policy in the consideration of any scheme that may come forward.	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Hyde	Januarys	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP		LAND WEST OF BEETONS WAY AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP IS IDENTIFIED AS A REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY AREA. THE COUNCIL WILL ENCOURAGE A MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE TO ACCOMMODATE SUITABLE USES, WHICH MAY INCLUDE BUT SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED TO LAND FOR HOUSING (INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING), LEISURE, COMMERCIAL, TRADE COUNTER OR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES. ANY SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE COUNCIL'S EXISTING DEPOT AND THE SKATE PARK CAN BE SUITABLY RELOCATED. DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LED THROUGH PREPARATION OF A CONCEPT MASTERPLAN.	Additional text has been added to Policy BV15 in the revised document to ensure that any proposals seek to maximise economic growth and do not generate any conflict with existing uses. It will for any planning application on this site to justify the uses being proposed in accordance with the policy.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is provided to support this comment	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Object to Barton Road and Eastern Way being designated for alternative business development because of proximity to dwellings and lack of confidence that residential areas would be protected by the planning system.	The policy has been amended to ensure that any potential alternative use does not conflict with existing uses.	Policy BV15 amended
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		The provision of specialist accommodation and provision for the elderly do not, as land uses, fit and sit comfortably with general employment and business development areas because of environmental effects and problems.	These facilities can come forward as individual planning applications and do not need to be allocated in a development plan.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Be wary of 'leisure' mixing with industrial - parking issues as with Curve Motion in Lamdin Road.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Such expansion in the east will put excessive pressure on the roads and infrastructure.	These employment sites are spread across the town.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has no comment on this issue at this time, other than to say that all development will need to include sustainable transport provision.	The comment is noted	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society questions the validity of this policy and whether it is too vague to commit to give favourable consideration to unspecified sui generis uses.	The policy has been amended to ensure that any potential alternative use does not conflict with	Policy BV15 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	no	We do not have any objection, in principle, to the inclusion of the British Sugar site within this policy, which would allow for alternative uses other than (B Class) through redevelopment and/ or re-use of the existing buildings. That said, however, the way in which the policy is drafted sends out an inappropriate message in terms of British Sugar's long term commitment to Bury St Edmunds. This also applies to the supporting paragraph 6.15, which could be interpreted that the British Sugar site is one of the older, inappropriately located, and/or poor quality employment sites. We request that this paragraph is amended to clarify that the British Sugar factory is not considered to be inappropriately located and/or of poor quality. We therefore strongly request that Policy BV15 is amended.	See below	Policy BV15 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapeys LLP	British Sugar Plc		We suggest the following wording. Policy BV15 - 'Within the following General Employment Areas, opportunities for redevelopment or re-use of sites and buildings for alternative commercial business/mixed activities, outside Class B uses, will be considered favourably where they maximise the sites' potential for economic growth and/or support the continued operation of the existing businesses and industrial activities, and do not conflict with policies elsewhere within the Development Plan'.	The policy has been amended in line with the comments received	Policy BV15 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes with the qualifications given below in b). In general, the use of the site should generally be limited to the Town's requirements for jobs. Expansion that goes beyond this will just provide jobs for people who do not live in the Borough and thus encourage many of them to move to the Town placing pressure on housing and the infrastructure. The Census of 2001 indicated that significant levels of the community were employed in the Town from outside the Borough. The very high number of vehicles heading to and from the A14 in the morning and evening seems to confirm this position.	St Edmundsbury has been identified as a growth area and government funding has been allocated to help develop infrastructure. It is important to obtain the right balance between jobs and homes and that economic growth does not spoil the environment. There continues to be a need to provide a wide range of jobs in the town to ensure the local economy is able to expand.	Additional para to reflect the statement added in jobs and economy section

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in</p>				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short				refer to question 17 (b) comment: protect and encourage smaller, local sites of business.	The Council supports this approach through the designation of mixed use development	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes	However council & developers cannot be trusted past experience shows this	No explanation is provided to support this comment	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Important to have flexibility bearing in mind changing patterns of doing business and the growth of the trade counter type of business.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 18: alternative Business Development within General Employment Areas (BV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the content of BV15?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	* British Sugar will not let this happen. * If British Sugar were to leave, Bury St Edmunds would fall as in employment * Who has got the money to turn that brown field site into green and houses.	This policy is not dependent upon British Sugar vacating the site. It is intended to make the most beneficial use of land alongside the operation of the sugar beet factory and draws a distinction between the potential for areas to the north and to the south of Compiegne Way.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Hope changes can be made to stop the re-occurrence of the 'bad egg' smell.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15941	Colin Murphy				I would like the development of Bury St Edmunds (centre and suburbs) to be enhanced by including protected areas as follows * existing water areas - such as the British Sugar lagoon - to be developed as recreational areas - ideal for model boating, walking, bird watching	The suggested uses would accord with the policy, although they should remain compatible with the continued operational requirements of the factory.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	Any development of such nature should be exploited at the first opportunity as it adds to the green credentials of the town, creating a `green oasis` near to the town centre and this would make a `destination` for eco tourism.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	The likelihood of this within the timescales of this Vision is extremely unlikely. British Sugar has 4 UK sites with Bury St Edmunds one of the largest beet processing plants with the only UK retail packaging plant alongside, next to the A14.	It is intended that this policy can be implemented alongside the continued operation of the sugar beet factory, providing opportunities for environmental enhancements.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	No further expansion of industrial development should take place here. The land should be wholly restored to recreational uses and nothing else.	The British Sugar site is already in active industrial use. This policy seeks to facilitate appropriate development together with environmental enhancements which could include recreational use. It would not be appropriate to hinder or restrict the existing use.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	no	As we have previously indicated, we have serious concerns in terms of the allocation of part of the site as 'lagoons' and, in particular with the aspiration of Policy BV16 to encourage the long term 'restoration' of the lagoons, residue beds, spoil and landscaped areas. As explained above, these areas exist as an integral part of the factory's operations and indeed, only exist as a result of industrial processes carried out on the site. Therefore, we consider that the aspiration to 'restore' is based on a fundamentally incorrect premise and may hinder the factory's future operational requirements to be met. Whilst we recognise the contributions these areas make to the wider environment, planning policy should not actively promote 'restoration' as it is based on the incorrect assumption that these are naturally created features.	It is not intended that the terminology used in the policy should hinder the continued legitimate operational requirements of the British Sugar factory which is recognised to be of importance to Bury St Edmunds and the wider area. The policy seeks to encourage a positive approach to the use of large areas of land which may be affected by operational changes or requirements. It draws a distinction between the development potential of land to the north and south of Compiegne Way. This could be addressed by amending the wording of the policy to reflect the continued operation of the factory and less emphasis on after-use.	Amend wording to policy to reflect continued operation of site by British Sugar. Replace requirement for a masterplan with a requirement for a design brief and remove reference to a supplementary planning document.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapeleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		'Restoration' would mean removing these features and could only occur if the whole operation were to be curtailed, which is not envisaged and should not form the basis of planning policies. Maintenance of these features will only occur as part of the industrial process, of which they are an integral part. British Sugar's committed to monitoring of wildlife and site conditions as part of the maintenance and management of the site. The proposed requirement for restoration will be a barrier to the future growth and responding to changing business requirements. This inappropriate policy approach would adversely affect currently planned initiatives to enhance operational sustainability through, for example, increased use of renewable sourced energy.	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		It is also unnecessary, because if any further development alterations are required by British Sugar, any protected species and wildlife value of the site would be taken into account, as a matter of course and in order to satisfy the requirements of other policies and provisions within the Development Plan. Policy BV16 also suggests that the land south of Compiegne Way is appropriate for a modest amount of employment uses (Class B2). Whilst we support such an aspiration, we consider that the GEA Policy BV14, which permits proposals for industrial and business development within GEAs, is best placed to confirm this position, and emphasise that all areas of the factory site should be included within the GEA.	The entire area to the south of Compiegne Way is included within the general employment area. The areas to the northeast and northwest of Compiegne Way are extensive and essential for the operation of the active sugar processing activity, but are not considered appropriate for general industrial use. Given the single ownership of the site, a design brief may be more appropriate than a masterplan and there is no requirement for its adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document.	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapeleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		In terms of the Masterplan approach and the subsequent requirement for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for any future redevelopment of the area, we strongly object, as such an approach would give rise to (potentially) substantial delays allowing the factory to grow and meet its operational requirements as required. This is contrary to the provisions set out in the NPPF, in that it seeks policies to meet the needs of existing businesses; to be flexible enough to accommodate the needs not anticipated in the plan; and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. The NPPF discourages the use of SPDs unless they are clearly justified.	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc		For the reasons stated above, there is no such justification to require a SPD for the factory site, and it would put significant burdens on British Sugar if a masterplan and/or a SPD is required before any development can proceed. In these terms, we strongly object to the allocation of British Sugar Lagoons and request that Policy BV16 is removed from the Vision 2031 DPD. The subject area should be included within the GEA designation (Policy BV14).	See above	no changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process.		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). In general, the use of the site should generally be limited to the Town's requirements for jobs. Expansion that goes beyond this will just provide jobs for people who do not live in the Borough and thus encourage many of them to move to the Town placing pressure on housing and the infrastructure. The Census of 2001 indicated that significant levels of the community were employed in the Town from outside the Borough. The very high number of vehicles heading to and from the A14 in the morning and evening seems to confirm this position.	The British Sugar site is of significant importance to the region, providing employment both within the site and to support industries, including the agricultural sector. It is not realistic, nor appropriate to place artificial limits on the employment potential of a national company.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document. (See attachments)				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short				N.B. No map included to illustrate BV16 clearly. therefore very difficult to comment.	The map is included in the Vision 2031 Preferred Options Proposal Map Book	No changes required
BVR21134 E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278 E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302 E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304 E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317 E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336 E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415 E	Jill Burrows			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431 E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488 E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510 E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538 E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Is this premature?	This policy is not dependent upon British Sugar vacating the site. It is intended to make the most beneficial use of land alongside the operation of the sugar beet factory.	No changes required
BVR21554 E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559 E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563 E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564 E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	Ensure leisure use includes Angling	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596 E	Anne Zarattini			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21607 E	R H Footer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623 E	Matthew Lamplough			no	NEVER BE CONVERTED TO BROWN FIELD IF BS LEFT. TOO EXPENSIVE BY FAR.	This policy is not dependent upon British Sugar vacating the site.	
BVR21632 E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21641 E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642 E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649 E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650 E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655 E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701 E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717 E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719 E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731 E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21732 E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row					
BVR21733 E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737 E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738 E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729 E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748 E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755 E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 19: British Sugar Lagoons(BV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV16?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760 E	Eddie Gibson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759 E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761 E	Philip Reeve			no	These are not redundant and are part of the manufacturing cycle for British Sugar	This policy is not dependent upon British Sugar vacating the site. It is intended to make the most beneficial use of land alongside the operation of the sugar beet factory.	No changes required
BVR21770 E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772 E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	No further development should be allowed until you provide the infrastructure to resolve the existing grid lock on Moreton Hall.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Very hard to see that the town needs even more out-of-town shopping areas. Every effort should be put into maintaining the viability of the town centre as the top priority for retail.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. This includes the impact of any such proposals upon the viability of the town centre.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>No further development should be allowed until the infrastructure to resolve the existing grid lock on Moreton Hall is provided.</p> <p>More parking is required for existing units including Sainsbury's and Homebase areas.</p>	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	No further development should be allowed until the infrastructure to resolve the existing grid lock on Moreton Hall is provided. More parking is required for existing units including Sainsbury's and Homebase areas.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	The town already is a failed retail park. Future development should be based upon its spiritual and secular status, its historic assets and the development based around these.	This designation is a recognition of the existing use of the area.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Deal with existing traffic before further expansion.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Existing traffic already causing heavy congestion at certain times.	This support is welcomed. The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	No further development should be allowed until the infrastructure to resolve the existing grid lock on Moreton Hall is provided. The Eastern relief road will do little to address this as most of the gridlock is caused by people getting into town, not out of it	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	As mentioned before large scale out of town shopping will kill the centre. There are possible exceptions as in large supplies and goods	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. These parameters include impact upon the town centre. It is intended to cater primarily for bulky goods retailing unsuited to a town centre location.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no	<p>Policy BV17 identifies the Bury St Edmunds retail Park and sets criteria against which future retail proposals will be assessed. This includes an assessment against the sequential and impact tests.</p> <p>Whilst the policy does not specifically allocate the site for retail development, supporting paragraph 6.18 states, "...it is not always possible to allocate bulky goods retailers in a central location and, therefore, provision for such stores is being made at Bury St Edmunds Retail Park and Tayfen Road (Policy BV9)".</p>	Although the area is intended primarily for bulky goods retailing, as stated, recognition is required of the existence of a significant convenience store, currently occupied by Sainsbury's.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no	Policy BV17 should therefore be amended to make specific reference to the site's identification for bulky goods retailing only and not be seen as encouraging non-bulky retail development (including convenience goods) at Bury St Edmunds retail Park.	See above	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>No trust in the council to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings. There is a need to equate housing with jobs but creating jobs does not mean that local people will be employed there.</p> <p>Inward and outward commuting BY CAR will continue and must be catered for. Less than 33% of Moreton Hall residents work at Suffolk Business Park. Publish the statistics.</p>	This policy relates to the designation of an area of land within the commercial area as a retail park. A council cannot control who lives or works where. What is required is a balance between homes and jobs.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Such continued expansion will inevitably change the character of BSE and to its detriment.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			BV17 would be improved by making specific reference to sustainable means of transport in part d).	Given that the site is specifically identified by the policy, category d) is superfluous	Delete category d)

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			In the light of the Portas Report, the Society recommends that a very cautious approach be taken to the provision of significant retail floorspace outside the town centre.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	BUT address the infrastructure problem first - how many times does this need to be stated?	The specific infrastructure problem is not identified, but if it relates to the localised congestion at peak times, this should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Moving retail premises to Moreton Hall makes them less accessible and causes increase in traffic movements. Retail premises that are local/central should be protected/encouraged so that access can be achieved on foot from town centre.	This criticism is acknowledged. The policy is designed to accommodate those forms of retailing which cannot be located within the town centre due to their bulky goods nature.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21079E	Annabel Mayer				but only after existing empty properties are put to use.	The allocation relates to an area which is already developed, so will relate primarily to the use of empty premises.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Ridiculous unnecessary development	The allocation is required to accommodate forms of retailing which cannot be accommodated within the town centre and would otherwise be lost to the town, necessitating trips elsewhere.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R. Taylor			yes	BUT only after existing empty properties are put to use.	The allocation relates to an area which is already developed, so will relate primarily to the use of empty premises.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes	Additional parking should be provided	The parking requirement will be reviewed in the context of each development proposed.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	There shouldn't be any further development until the existing traffic problems at Moreton Hall have been addressed and the required infrastructure is in place.	The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	No further development should be allowed until the infrastructure to resolve the existing grid lock on Moreton Hall is provided. More parking is required for existing units including Sainsbury's and Homebase areas.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. The congestion currently experienced at peak times should be addressed by policies elsewhere within this document. The parking requirement will be reviewed in the context of each development proposed.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The estate can not cope with the current parking and traffic. Of a weekend cars are regularly parked on the grass verges around the park as the car park is full. No further building should occur until the roads and parking are improved.	The policy does not propose further development, but recognises the existing use of the site and sets appropriate parameters for the consideration of applications for alternative uses/redevelopment opportunities. The parking requirement will be reviewed in the context of each development proposed.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 20: Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV17?	Question 20b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	I am not happy with proposals to site retail warehousing on Tayfen Road. The Council must take steps to rescue the Town Centre first	This policy does not relate to Tayfen Road.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes, as far as they go, but I think there is a need to improve the infrastructure, especially transport infrastructure to support employment, and also not to build more houses unless jobs are available for the people who live in them.	The Council considers that transport infrastructure is important and highlight the importance of efficient transport networks and improving infrastructure in the Travel section of the document.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes	We broadly agree with the aspirations for the local economy, specifically the allocation of the Moreton Hall/Suffolk Business Park and construction of the relief road. That support is qualified by the potential constraint on delivery of jobs and economic growth arising from the expectation that the relief road will be completed and operational before any economic development takes place and the financial viability of such works in the present and predicted economic circumstances.	This is a constraint arising from the capacity of the existing junctions with the A14 Trunk Road. The problem identified is acknowledged and the council is working with all parties and agencies to seek a solution.	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Failure to recognise the need for maxim diversity in small shops and business in the town and the importance of its cultural and spiritual significance	The Council wishes to encourage the diversity of business. The Bury St Edmunds Town centre theme, aspiration 1 addresses this issue.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We concur with the aspirations for jobs and the economy. We welcome the forging of closer links between employers, the schools and the West Suffolk College and, in particular, the suggested increase in apprenticeships by the introduction of a wage subsidy scheme and apprenticeship support packages. However, the plan does not suggest who will fund these proposals. It will be important to ensure that the Suffolk Business Park provides for the required range of sizes of employment sites and premises.	This issue will be considered at the delivery plan stage.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The vibrancy of any large community is in the ability to circulate wealth. Key to this is jobs and more importantly the employment of the young where their energies are tapped for the good of the business and the larger community.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		We have set out above supporting information on these matters in the answers to the various questions posed previously.	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock				5.Jobs in the area need to be created before any of this takes place or are we to become a commuter town for Cambridge? (My husband was offered a job here in Bury St Edmunds before we moved here)	The Council considers that there needs to be a wide range of jobs in the town.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Get present school situation sorted ASAP. New secondary school much needed on Moreton Hall ASAP but not built under Rougham aerodrome flight paths.	The Schools Organisation Review (SOR) is being carried out by the County Council. The Upper School identified for Moreton Hall will avoid the identified flight paths.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	No. The whole basis is expansion of the outer edges of the town which is not to the benefit overall of the town.	A balance is required between the provision of adequate homes to meet demand and the retention of countryside. Extensions to the settlement boundary have been considered, as well as redevelopment of brownfield land. The proposed option is considered to be the most appropriate outcome, considering the likely future needs of the Town.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>It may be worth expanding point i) of paragraph 6.5 to include reference to 'local authority procedures, in addition to planning requirements. In fact, these aspirations could be modified to give greater detail on the ways in which local government can influence business growth. For example; point c) could be elaborated to refer to the role that policy areas such as car parking, licensing or environmental health has in economic development. The county council would not have any disagreement with aspiration 2, though it is difficult to see how the actions proposed in 6.20 deliver on this aspiration. Important and worthy actions they may be, but protecting the natural and historic environment and ensuring environmental efficiency do not directly deliver jobs. Perhaps the actions that deliver on this aspiration should focus on delivery of land and support for sectors with high growth potential for secure and high paid jobs in Bury St Edmunds.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Paragraph 6.5 I has been amended to read 'barriers to growth' which is more inclusive. Paragraph 6.20 has been omitted as this is covered elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.5(i) and paragraph 6.20 has been deleted.</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>In addition, the Borough Council may wish to use this strategy to outline how it might work with Job Centre Plus on getting people into work.</p> <p>Lastly, the borough council will be very aware of the issues around delivery of employment land. The allocation for Suffolk Business Park is a good example of this. Vision 2031 perhaps ought to set out some reference to the borough council having an ambition to work with partners such as the Local Enterprise Partnerships to deliver employment sites. The county council would support this approach, and would be pleased to participate.</p>	Reference made to working with LEPs in paragraph 6.4	Reference made to working with LEPs in paragraph 6.4
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with the qualifications given below in b). Whilst some parts of the aspirations are fine, they focus too much on trying to provide sufficient business premises and jobs to meet the proposed major growth of the Town and making it a sub-regional centre [page 38, item 6.6 of Vision]. This situation was imposed as part of the East of England Regional Authority's plan for Bury, which is no longer valid and should be abandoned. Unemployment is comparatively low in the Town and there needs to be a proportionate increase in the provision of business premises and jobs to meet the needs of the town's current population, plus a modest growth. Allowance should not be made for a population growth of the order contained in the Core Strategy. We have noted this position in the responses to questions 17, 18, 19 and 20.	It is an underlying trend that demand continues to outweigh supply. Economic growth is required to provide adequate jobs for a growing population. As such, it is the intent of this document to ensure that suitable employment sites are provided in appropriate areas to meet the long-term sustainability of the town and support for the provision of local jobs for local people.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various</p>				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short				No. There are numerous empty business premises in and around Bury. These should be used/adapted by new businesses. Resources (cropland, material, energy) should not be wasted developing brand new premises.	Acknowledge that existing vacant premises can address some of the need, but it is inadequate to meet the needs of the town for the next 20 years.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Too idealistic & again council & developers cannot be trusted it is all a lot of waffle	Noted	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	There needs to be a clear and active partnership between the council & businesses to deliver a prosperous & dynamic economy. Thought should be given to the balancing the needs of business and that of the community. for example large HGVs regularly using country lanes. Do the needs of business outweigh road safety, and environmental health issues?	Thank you for your support. Adequate attenuation to local infrastructure is a prerequisite of any planning permission being granted. Whilst economic growth is encouraged, this is not be at the cost of public health and road safety. Should proposals for economic growth not adequately address traffic and health issues in the area then it would not be supported by the council.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	The Borough has limited premises it owns and the private sector has supplied most of the business space in Bury over the past 30 plus years. The Borough needs to be more proactive in engaging the private sector rather like Haverhill 2000 and to engage with business and to ensure that planning policies do not hold up development.	St Edmundsbury does have limited premises in its ownership in Bury St Edmunds, and indeed the private sector has brought forward the majority of business space in recent years. St Edmundsbury Borough Council, working in partnership with Forest Heath District council, is committed to delivering growth in West Suffolk and will work with partners and private sector developers to ensure economic prosperity for its residents.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	There is a particular need for an incubation unit to focus on high tech and innovative business ideas with appropriate support. The actions regarding inward investment need also to be linked to the developments in education and training in order to demonstrate the availability of training for new jobs.	Research was undertaken prior to the recession to identify the need for an incubation centre within West Suffolk. This research is to be refreshed to identify the current position, taking into consideration the current economic climate and the position forecast for the future, for such a facility in the area. The availability of skilled staff, and the access to skills and work based training, are clearly influential factors to the growth of every local economy. Undoubtedly any business starting in, or considering a move to, an area will factor this into its decision process. St Edmundsbury works closely with, and supports our partners to attract inward investment from overseas and from within the UK, as well as the educational establishments to try to ensure the demands of employers, both current and future, are met.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough				You cannot rely on Cambridge etc for employment as they and other towns are building the same as bury eg Thetford, Red Lodge etc	The Council agrees that it needs to retain and increase employment in the town and surrounding areas.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 21: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and economy?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	More overt support for the agricultural economy and promotion of suitable job / training opportunities.	The Council recognises that, whilst agriculture has greatly declined, it remains of importance to the economy of the area.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	Jobs for the young is essential to tap their energies and SEBC to maintain a healthy, safe area.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes	<p>Completely car-free centre except for residents and market-traders (allowed in by automatic recognition of vehicles), served by frequent electric buses (and electric taxis - why not?) from the estates and from outlying collector hub part-and-rides. All kerbs could be levelled or graded, with lots of benches and bike-parks, flower-beds, trees, concessions in semi-permanent stalls, buskers' spaces etc. Every day could be a bit like market-day on a smaller scale.</p> <p>The balance of interest between the arc and the old town centre needs to be restored in favour of the historic grid if there is to be any hope of retaining the town's historic character. The arc is just shops and could be anywhere.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	<p>Pedestrianisation wherever possible</p> <p>Removal of car parking from scenic areas such as Angel Hill</p> <p>Repaving with appropriate paving materials (unlike the shingle in Guildhall St)</p> <p>Removing intrusive traffic signs</p> <p>Installing tactful and appropriate street furniture</p> <p>Creating separate cycleways for cyclists and preventing them from cycling on narrow pavements.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes	<p>Improve paving in the town centre</p> <p>Sort out 7.16</p> <p>Provide a better link between Arc and marketplace</p> <p>Reduce signage</p> <p>Improve lane marking to separate cycles and pedestrians and ensure the markings are consistent</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.</p>	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes	<p>Ensure proper connexion between the old town centre and the Arc development.</p> <p>Even though the Arc is a pretty depressing place, it is made even worse by the connexion to the old town centre by a series of dismal alleyways and the windswept wasteland of St Andrews St North.</p>	<p>The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes	<p>The paving in the town centre should be improved.</p> <p>Aspiration 4 para. 7.16 requires an urgent and effective resolution.</p> <p>Provide a better link between Arc and marketplace</p> <p>Reduce signage.</p> <p>Generally review safety of the interface between Cyclists and Pedestrians particularly but not exclusively on joint pathways/cycleways.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	<p>We welcome ideas for extending car free areas within the town centre.</p> <p>We would also support 'pedestrian priority' areas and the imaginative use of textured surfaces for demarcation. Secure bicycle shelters is a must</p>	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes	The paving in the town centre should be improved. Aspiration 4 para. 7.16 requires an urgent and effective resolution. Provide a better link between Arc and marketplace Reduce signage. Generally review safety of the interface between Cyclists and Pedestrians particularly but not exclusively on joint pathways/cycleways.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	Introduction of shared space schemes, particularly mixed pedestrian and cycle areas. Otherwise, transport by bicycle will never materialise. www.sustrans.org.uk/assets/files/Info%20sheets/ff04.pdf see photo of Peterborough on p3 as an example for town centre.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	no change	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Cycle tracks/pedestrians remote from roads if possible. Integrate arc better now we have it.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	We are supportive of the principle of improving pedestrian environment in the town centre.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	We would suggest a specific development plan for the Town Centre which: 1.Integrates brownfield developments. 2.Improves the pedestrian experience in terms of wayfinding and the legibility of the retail circuit. 3.Improves access to and interchange with transport nodes such as the Train and Bus Stations.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We support the enhancement of pedestrian and cycling links in and around the town and the proposed actions to improve on the present situation. Increased pedestrianisation of the Cornhill/Buttermarket area would be welcome as would an increase in safe routes to schools. It will also be important to ensure that within new neighbourhoods priority is given to pedestrians and cyclists.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Improved link between the town centre and the ARC required.	The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15954	Dawn Parnell			yes	Better maintenance of footpaths.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Cycle routes	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	The paving in the town centre should be improved. The total pedestrianisation of the top half of St Johns St should be considered now making it `joined` with the Buttermarket as this appears to be one area where small independent businesses flourish. The link between Buttermarket and the Arc should be widened considerably to join these 2 areas up.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes	Introduce a 'no traffic' zone in town centre at certain times of the day. Restrict Looms Lane and Guildhall Street for disabled drivers only at these particular times.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Abbeygate Street, Buttermarket and Cornhill should be pedestrians only. The last two must grant access to market traders' vehicles for a limited time on market days. Skinner Street should be free of vehicles and wheeled bins 24/7. View Maria Naylor's 'Sacred' video to see what Skinner Street should look like. Gradually, short stay in-street parking charges in the town centre should be raised until they are higher than the off-street equivalent. Suffolk Council needs to agree to this. All on-street free parking must go, including in Out Northgate and on Station Hill. Permit parking should be a feature of both Conservation Areas. Do not widen any road especially Tayfen Road. As a town centre resident, may I have a pavement outside my front gate? Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The distinction between pedestrians and cycle routes needs to be explored and should be the preserve of the local community associations to review and provide solutions. This buy in is essential for a rapid uptake of the changes to go away from motorised transport.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	It's time for the council to consider the needs of local people rather than expensive beautification of the town centre. Much of the paving is hazardous and unfit for purpose. However it looks pretty and is expensive which seems to satisfy the aspirations of the council who plead poverty but continue to waste money. Removing cars from Cornhill/Buttermarket area can be achieved with a couple of bollard so no requirement to waste even more. Motorists are also pedestrians.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock				6. <input type="checkbox"/> I note that you say in your leaflet 'Bury St Edmunds - Vision for 2031' that 'Streets in the historic core are of high quality and give priority to pedestrians'. Have the planners taken the time recently to walk around the pavements? Maybe they should look down at their feet and see what an awful and dangerous state some of these pavements are in with so many different surfaces and unfilled cracks and potholes.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	People visit towns because they have shops. Shops need stock. This is no longer delivered by hand cart - access for delivery vehicles required. Shoppers will always want to park outside shops.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion	A critical issue will be how any improvements are funded in a climate when only limited resources are likely to be available for infrastructure. Careful consideration will need to be given to whether the benefits of improving the town centre's pedestrian environment outweighs other items of infrastructure which might be delivered.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Too late now for Angel Hill but please, no more York Stone. Looks OK but not easy to walk on it when wet, one gets wet feet from puddles.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Zebra crossings in appropriate places in town centre. Clear instructions re cycle paths and ensure they are used appropriately.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	There are adequate footpaths in the town centre.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The council's Local Transport Plan sets out the long term transport strategy for the next 20 years. Key aims of the strategy are to support sustainable economic growth, improve access and encourage walking and cycling, so the county council does support all efforts to improve pedestrian options in the town centre.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society suggests that investment in the public realm (both enhancement schemes and maintenance of existing schemes) needs to be given greater emphasis. The Society believes that a reduction in the number of trips can only be delivered by mixed use developments and placing jobs, homes and services in close, walkable proximity. It is not acceptable that cheap public transport is realistic or deliverable in the current climate. However, the Society does believe that improved rail links could reduce the use of private cars by out commuters to work.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents.				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Enough roads are closed already - makes delivery to shops more difficult - we want to encourage shopkeepers not discourage them.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			yes	Change the surface and the status of more streets to that existing in the Abbeygate St pedestrianised model, inc g: remainder of Abbeygate St, Woolhall St, Cornhill, Buttermarket; plus parts of Risbygate St, Kings Road and St Andrews St South around new shopping centre.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21134 E	Richard Hobbs			yes	I would extend the pedestrian only area to prevent vehicles crossing Abbeygate Street when it is closed. I would exclude vehicles from the Butter Market and the road separating the Arc from the rest of Town. This would reduce risk of accidents, and integrate the core better. Of course, improving the squalid alleys between the Arc and the Butter Market by demolishing ugly, random 1950s developments between the two would be no bad thing but would presumably cost too much.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21278 E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302 E	Charles Crane			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21304 E	Kate Stittle			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21306 E	Mrs E Bunn			no	Money has already been spent on this	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317 E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21336 E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415 E	Jill Burrows			no	Too much pedestrianisation already causing traffic chaos!	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21431 E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445 E	David Chapman			yes	Close the Buttermarket/Cornhill area to traffic as it is on market days. Enforce the pedestrianisation of St Andrew's Street south as at present it is dangerous for pedestrians.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21459 E	Sarah Green			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488 E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21510 E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Buttermarket/Cornhill need to be softened and calmed. Less paint and tarmac. However need to meet the needs of business, deliveries, contractor parking etc. The short stretch between Woolhall Street and the top of Abbeygate street - currently one way - should be two way to allow traffic to escape. Gridlock in the town at some point most days of the week.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21538 E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	More soft landscaping breaking up the car parking ,more shared space. Unlike most towns people live in Central Bury and the balance needs to be struck between pedestrians and traffic.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21554 E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21559 E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563 E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564 E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21596 E	Anne Zarattini			no	On open town centre is special to this town. We have the ugly Arc as a pedestrian area already	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21607 E	R H Footer			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623 E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632 E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641 E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642 E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649 E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	Aspiration 4 para. 7.16 requires an urgent and effective resolution. Provide a better and safer link between Arc and marketplace.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR21650 E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655 E	Carol Eagles			yes	Better link needed between the Arc and centre.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR21701 E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717 E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719 E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	yes	A Shared-Space system in the town centre should be encouraged wherever possible, especially in the Cornhill, Buttermarket, St Andrews Street South and Risbygate Street.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21731 E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733 E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737 E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738 E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	I do not however agree with 7.1 in Vision 2031. You can encourage all you like, but people will still use their cars. If I had a family of 2 young kids, I would not get the bus to Tesco/Asda from my house in a field near Fornham All Saints, all the way to the shops, and then do my weekly shop and bus it all home again. I would get in my car (probably a 4x4 gas guzzler) and drive into Bury where 20 -30 mins later (having driven all of 3 miles) I would do my shopping. I will then pile about 10 carrier bags of shopping, 2 kids, and 1 pram into the boot, and spend another 20 - 30 mins driving home, in peak traffic on a Saturday afternoon. I wouldn't be able to carry my own shopping for a single adult on the bus!	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729 E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes	Priority for pedestrians and cyclists to encourage active travel as suggested. Consideration of safety issues - to address the needs of older people and the very young/children.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29	No changes required
BVR21748 E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755 E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 22: Pedestrian Environment

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you think that there is a need to improve the pedestrian environment in the town centre?	Question 22b - What would you suggest is appropriate?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760 E	Eddie Gibson			yes	Better link between the old and new parts of BSE town centre. Fully pedestrianise the old market square area and adjoining access roads. This will encourage the use of other parking facilities, currently operating below capacity on most days. It will also create a more pleasant pedestrian environment, similar to those in places such as Norwich and Cambridge. It will also ensure that the environment around the "old" and "new" stores in the town (i.e. those in the Arc) are similar and complimentary.	Thank you for your comments. The council supports pedestrianisation and is seeking to reduce conflicts, where they exist, between motor vehicles, pedestrians and other users. These issues and specific projects will be considered during the production of a town wide masterplan in accordance with Policy BV29. The Council continues to support the provision of a link which at present is financially unviable.	No changes required
BVR21759 E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761 E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21770 E	Emma Ball			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772 E	Julia Wakelam			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Bailam			yes		Noted	None
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Noted	None
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Noted	None
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			<p>2.1 <input type="checkbox"/> Thetford</p> <p>The Council considers reference to Thetford and the journeys in-between the two towns warrants mention in the Travel section on page 15. Bury St. Edmunds is an attraction for Breckland residents as it provides health and education services as well as retail and employment opportunities.</p> <p>It is noted that throughout the document, Bury St Edmunds is actively promoted as a destination and an attractor of visitors for employment, retail, health and education (e.g. at 6.5(e), the introduction to section 10, 13.16(c) and 15.4(a)). Furthermore, section 14.5 refers to the use of Thetford Forest by residents of Bury St Edmunds. It is noted that policies BV24 and BV25 encourage the use of Travel Plans for the Hospital and College respectively.</p>	<p>The council welcomes the comments and is committed to working across boundaries with neighbouring authorities to deal with issues arising in a coherent manner. An additional paragraph on cross boundary working has been inserted in the introduction to the document. The close relationship between villages to the north of the borough and Thetford has been referenced in the Rural Vision document.</p>	<p>New paragraph on cross boundary working inserted in introduction.</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			Breckland Council (through the Thetford Area Action Plan) acknowledges the role Bury St Edmunds has in relation to Thetford (and indeed the southern extents of the District) by providing Health and Further (and Higher) education and seeks to ensure that the bus is a real and attractive alternative to single occupancy car use. Indeed potential improvements that are being proposed as part of the Planning Application for the Urban Extension to Thetford could assist St. Edmundsbury residents. Under the duty to co-operate, as detailed in the Localism Act, there appears to be clear opportunities for cross boundary working on this issue between Breckland Council, St. Edmundsbury Council, Suffolk County Council and Norfolk County Council to ensure journeys related to the proposals in the Vision which seek to attract visitors to Bury St Edmunds can be undertaken by modes other than single occupancy car use.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			The proposals for bus services as part of the Planning Application for the Thetford Urban Extension could aid St. Edmundsbury rural areas (7.4(1)) which is discussed in more in detail in relation to the Rural Vision.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	<p>See above. The council needs to be proactive in planning for alternatives to all car use, as car use will only decline in the short-term if there are already good alternatives in place; in the longer-term, when there is no choice but to abandon cars for short- and medium-distance travel due to high fuel costs, people will need an established system of affordable clean public transport already there to transfer to if they are to be able to continue to use the town for shopping and recreation.</p> <p>For commuting, improved train services must be planned now, including electrification of the Cambridge to Stowmarket line and the doubling of the Kennet to Cambridge section. The council should take the lead in this, taking a stronger position than that implied by "lobbying", including investing in feasibility studies.</p> <p>Cycle-lanes and "walkable" suburbs are of little use to the elderly or the disabled.</p>	The Council agrees that alternatives to the car need to be promoted and this is included within our aspirations.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes	Priority to 7.21, sort out access from A14	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	The travel aspirations are almost entirely for motherhood and apple pie, based on hopes and dreams with little evidence that funding will be ever available for anything significant to be done. No-one would disagree with construction of improved cycle networks, but to rely on them as; The Plan; to ameliorate traffic congestion is fanciful. The one sensible proposal is to aim for improvements to the railway connexion to Cambridge and thus to London. The reality is that this prime historic town will be reduced to a state of daily gridlock because of the absence of any coherent and funded strategy to cope with the vastly increased traffic implied by the unrealistic proposals for growth.	The Delivery Plan will outline how these aspirations will be developed and delivered. The Council recognises that funding is, and will continue to be, an issue.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes	Give priority and funding to resolve the issue in para. 7.21, sort out access from A14. Consider providing Park & Ride or Park & Share facilities.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	We strongly urge the Borough to lobby for the improvement of the A14. However the Society also considers that there has to be a limit on the ability of the town to accommodate the traffic generated by this major trunk route. In particular, we are concerned at the considerable noise generated by the A14 and would like to see measures to mitigate this problem. Society would support the Borough's aspirations to improve the Cambridge rail link. We would also support a new Railway Halt at Moreton Hall.	The support is welcomed and this is an aspiration in this section.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes	Give priority and funding to resolve the issue in para. 7.21, sort out access from A14. Consider providing Park & Ride or Park & Share facilities.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes	We support the proposal set out in paragraph 7.19 to the effect that developers of strategic sites should work together and with the highway authority to deliver co-ordinated solutions to traffic and transport issues	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	Action is required now as we are becoming grid locked at certain times NOW. Lobbying is not an answer. Roads first Building second. Developer to pay or find another developer....	The Council considers that this issue is addressed in 7.19. This paragraph highlights the importance of developers working together to assess the impact of sites of traffic.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	<p>There must be firm proposals for developing a comprehensive, usable public transport system. Successful public transport schemes require some regulation and subsidy. They boost the local economy, so pay for themselves that way.</p> <p>There should be strategic planning for park and ride, frequent bus services, adequate morning and evening provision, Dutch style provision for bicycles.</p> <p>Bus routes must follow passenger needs, not merely the providers' drive for profit. Plan the routes and services around the consumers' needs.</p> <p>There must be a strategic plan for dealing with road congestion.</p> <p>There must be strategic planning for access to the railway station including much greater parking see above.</p>	Alternative sustainable transport solutions are supported by the document. Any future development would be required to provide reasonable provision suited to the particular needs of the development and its integration into the existing transport network.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	A park & ride designed for Bury.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	<p>The aspirations seem fine, but we would want to emphasise that, since SEBC considers that the route currently through Westley one of the primary road corridors, then the importance of a West Bury relief road is all the more important since heavy-load traffic is currently routed elsewhere (some through the town) to avoid the weight restrictions on Westley Lane).</p> <p>7.20: We would also like to see more commitment to seek improvements to the rail service, and not just a mention of intent to lobby rail operators. We need an additional railway halt to the east of Bury to reduce traffic into the centre, and if necessary we should seek support from our MPs, who in turn need to apply additional pressure nationally. Again, as mentioned elsewhere, a successful managed road policy and an improved transport infrastructure should be a precondition of any development.</p>	Thank you for your support. Improvements to rail infrastructure are dealt with on a regional basis. Although it is the intention to support rail improvements it is not within the remit of the Borough Council to implement this.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood			The provision of specialist Care accommodation on the edge of Bury St. Edmunds, such as at Nowton Court, can properly make use of the existing bus services, extended where appropriate, together with the provision of specialist travel vehicles operated by the Care Villages to facilitate appropriate connections to Bury St. Edmunds centre, the railway and bus station, etc. apart from normal visits. This would all be part of a beneficial travel plan.	Details of travel plans will be assessed and determined in conjunction with any future planning applications, as appropriate. Appropriate and sustainable travel options is a common theme throughout this vision document and associated planning policies such as the Core Strategy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>Berkeley are supportive of the three key transport priorities to support sustainable development of the town as set out in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 and endorsed in the draft Vision 2031:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing demand for travel. • Efficient use of transport networks. • Improving infrastructure. <p>In pursuing these priorities Berkeley also support the view that the developers of the proposed strategic sites should work together with the highway authorities to seek to achieve common ground on identifying the scope and delivery mechanisms for the range of measures that will be necessary to accommodate and manage the impacts of the planned growth.</p>	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>Reducing Demand for Travel</p> <p>In planning the proposed north east Bury strategic site, Berkeley will reduce travel demand and car dependency by a range of measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritisation of movement on foot, by cycle and public transport. • Provision of adequate facilities and services for ease of movement on foot, by cycle and public transport. • Integration of neighbourhoods and facilities to ensure ease of movement on foot and by cycle. • Provision of safe routes to school. • Preparation of Travel Plans, including opportunities for measures such as car share and car pools or clubs. <p>The enclosed indicative Figure 1 illustrates a range of potential pedestrian and cycle routes that would enhance ease of access to the proposed north east Bury strategic site.</p>	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>Efficient Use of Transport Networks</p> <p>Berkeley will seek to ensure that key transport links between the proposed north east Bury strategic site and the town centre and major employment areas will perform at an acceptable level of service. This could be achieved by a range of measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving flows on congested roads. • Support for existing or new bespoke bus services. • Provision of walk and cycle facilities easing connection between the proposed strategic site to the railway station and town centre. <p>The enclosed Figure 2 shows the existing bus network in Bury St Edmunds. Figure 3 shows a potential route for a bespoke shuttle service for the proposed north east Bury strategic site.</p>	Reference to the	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>Improving Infrastructure</p> <p>It will be necessary to deliver a range of transport infrastructure improvements to sustain the level of planned growth at Bury St Edmunds. With regard to the strategic sites this will include highway infrastructure in the form of safe accesses to the developments , off site junction improvements to alleviate congestion, and other measures to improve traffic circulation, manage traffic flows and improve integration with public transport services.</p> <p>In order to assess the need for such measures Berkeley agrees that it is appropriate to look at the cumulative effects of the planned level of growth at Bury St Edmunds rather than to treat each development site in isolation. This is to consider the strategic sites broadly to include the planned growth in the town centre and other schemes having significant transport implications.</p>	<p>The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.</p>	<p>Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			To this end Berkeley have therefore developed a 'skeleton' strategic traffic model of Bury St Edmunds using the comprehensive suite of traffic surveys of the town that were jointly commissioned in 2011 by Berkeley and two of the other strategic site developers. The model has been calibrated and validated in accordance with DfT guidance and therefore provides an appropriate tool for assessing the cumulative impacts of the planned level of growth at Bury St Edmunds to 2031, including the five strategic sites. The extent of the modelled highway network is shown on Figure 4. In due course the model can be refined to a greater level of detail to allow detailed investigations of specific individual junctions.	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>The model results to date allow some broad high level conclusions to be drawn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed level of growth to 2031 at Bury St Edmunds can be accommodated on the local highway network subject to provision of an appropriate range of junction improvements and the Eastern Relief Road. • Each of the three grade separated junctions on the A14 (J42, J43 and J44) will require capacity improvements. • In terms of the level of performance of the local highway network there will be considerable benefit in securing further modal shift away from car use. • With regard to the proposed north east Bury strategic site there are a range of junctions in the near vicinity that may require varying degrees of improvement due to the cumulative effects of the planned level of overall growth in the town (broadly indicated on Figure 5). These will now require more detailed modelling and capacity assessments, to be agreed with the highway authorities, in order to identify the specific scope of required improvements. 	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>Delivery Mechanisms</p> <p>The mechanisms for delivery of the required range of highway improvements and other transport measures have yet to be identified and in Berkeley's view will need to be the subject of negotiations between the five strategic site developers, other developers in the town, and the highway authorities.</p> <p>The funding for the infrastructure improvements may be secured through Section 106 Agreements and/or some form of tariff mechanism such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, and will need to have regard to which items are to be funded in whole by particular developers, which are to be the subject of partial developer contributions, and which are to be funded by the highway authorities.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	The Branch concurs with the plan's travel aspirations including its prioritisation of transport modes in the order of walking, cycling, public transport including taxis, and cars. It also agrees with the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2031 (SCC) priorities to support sustainable development of the town which comprise: reducing demand for travel, efficient use of transport networks, and improving infrastructure. However, this topic requires more detailed comment than can be included in this response. Suffice it to say that transport and travel are, without doubt, one of the key issues of the plan. On all past performance, and bearing in mind that important elements of transport and travel provision are beyond the Borough's control, we do not consider that the proposed actions of	Thank you for your support. The issues and objectives set out in the response are acknowledged by the council. The feasibility of implementing the proposals will be assessed through the on-going local plan process and when assessing development proposals. It is not considered to be realistic to include detailed travel requirements at this stage of the planning process.	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lobbying for improvement of the A14 and the access routes into the town; • safeguarding primary route corridors in the town to ensure that congestion is minimised; and • lobbying for the improvement of the rail link to Cambridge and London, <p>are by themselves going to resolve problems which already exist and will (unless radical action is taken) get significantly worse over the plan period. However, notwithstanding this, the urgent need to get additional lorry traffic removed from the A14 and onto rail remains, and it will be essential to continue to press hard for improvements to the local rail network. Further, there is an acute need for truly innovative thinking in relation to reorganising public transport within the town, including considering the acquisition of small or smaller scale demand led sustainable public transport vehicles.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			<p>In part the funding for an updated public transport system will need to come from the public purse, but there will also be a need to obtain significant contributions from the developers of the five proposed 'villages'. It is all very well proposing that within the proposed 'villages' everything should be accessible on foot or by bicycle. The real problems will occur in endeavouring satisfactorily to connect the new residents to the town centre and enabling them to cross the town. It is the cost of establishing a public transport system which the majority of people will want to use in these situations which should be largely borne by the developers of these proposed outlying sites. It needs to be remembered that if such a transport system is not established current traffic problems in the town will get markedly worse for existing residents which, bearing in mind it is they who will have to assimilate the new development, would be quite unfair.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			<p>Finally, and not least, enhancement work to the A14 junctions will become essential quite early in the plan period. While this is in part outside the control of the Borough it may well prove to be the case that developer contributions should play a part in achieving this objective. Further, we are aware that there is an agreement between the Highways Agency, Suffolk County Council and the Borough, to develop and implement a robust demand management strategy to resolve the current and intensifying problems at the A14 junctions. We urge that the planning element of this work be undertaken as soon as possible and consulted on in the Autumn of 2012, together with the next draft of Bury Vision 2031, so that it is clear to all how the problems will be addressed and when the work will be undertaken. This is an essential element in both the completion of the plan and its implementation.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			We note that Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy Community Infrastructure Capacity and Tariffs provides for charges of the nature we suggest to be made - much of it as 'Fundamental Infrastructure'. We trust that the Community Infrastructure Levy will be such that the problems described above will be properly addressed.	These issues will be considered during the setting up of the community infrastructure levy	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	A park and ride for busy periods.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	If the development on the Westley site proceeds it should be a condition of any development that the inner relief road should be put in place before any development starts. Heavy vehicles already ignore weight restrictions and travel through Westley Village.	The need for this development is already established. Other issues are addressed by the concept statement and will developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	Give priority and funding to resolve the issue in para. 7.21, sort out access from A14. Consider providing Park & Ride or Park & Share facilities.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no	See attached PDF	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The issues in relation to the funding of infrastructure will be considered at a later date.	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Aspiration is a word for the weak. Determination is better	Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The improvement of the A14 is the major prerequisite for the development of the North East and South East sites. The Eastern Relief Road is a must for the Moreton Hall development whether business or residential. These requirements are Core Strategy objectives and MUST be implemented prior to ANY development.	Thank you for your support. Core strategy policies remain extant and shall be applied alongside this document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>What actions? What improvements are proposed to access routes into town? When questioned on existing problems, neither the borough council nor county council have any idea how to resolve them. What does safeguard primary road corridors mean?</p> <p>What does lobby for improvements to the rail link mean? There have been no improvements to the Orttewell Road and Hollow Road rail bridges so there can be no confidence that either council has any inclination to lobby. Creating pinch-points at both bridges should not be considered a success.</p> <p>The twin track approach of denying the scale of highway problems and blaming motorists cannot continue.</p>	<p>The council shall continue to support and encourage sustainable development. The document sets out aspirations for the Town. Detailed proposals that address the issues set out in this document would be assessed at application stage.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		The provision of facilities and accommodation for the elderly in or adjoining the urban boundary can reasonably be accommodated by existing travel patterns, existing bus services or reasonable extensions to existing bus services. Some facilities such as Nursing homes, because of their nature, generate low levels of travel other than visitors and can be accommodated reasonably in or on the edge of the urban area such as at Nowton Court.	The comments are noted	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Increased use of trains = increased cars parked on streets near to station as travellers will not pay parking charges (Station Hill and Northgate Ave).	Thank you for your support. Your comments have been noted.	None

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves				We are aware that developers have collaborated with the Borough Council to undertake a detailed and extensive traffic survey of the road network around the town. It is most regrettable that the findings of this survey have not been made available in time to inform public response to the Vision 2031 consultations. The reality is that local bus services are unlikely to profoundly change the general preference for car use and a growth in private vehicle traffic should be assumed. If the wider use of bus services is to be an imperative, then the timings of those services, particularly late evening provision must be addressed.	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites. Cycling is supported by the council which is emphasised in the actions and aspirations in this section	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15993	John Dean				<p>There are some minor things which I think can improve traffic flow, because keeping a steady flow is the answer to heavy traffic movement, speed is not important. Speeds should be reduced to 20 mph, in heavy traffic, which lowers fuel usage, noise levels, frustrations (once drivers get use to it) and improves safety for all. Widen the roads slightly so an HGV or other wide vehicle can pass a cyclist safely without affecting its speed and also protecting the road edges from damage, ensure there are laybys to prevent traffic stopping or parking on the carriageway. None of this is worthwhile of course without first tackling the bottlenecks. Once a wider view is taken of solving these problems allowing underpasses, overhead travel, avoiding traffic fighting for the same piece of road, restrictions can be eased.</p>	<p>The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.</p>	<p>Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Dean				<p>One of the main themes to reduce traffic congestion is cited in 2031 as changing the public's pattern of travelling by more use of cycling. There are basically two ways of doing this in my view, either by restrictions, say increasing the price of fuel dramatically, which cannot be achieved on a local basis, or by encouragement and enlightenment through training and example. The recent development of new cycle tracks on the East of the town are very good but can still be improved. In my opinion cycle tracks are best on a stand alone basis, not strictly tried to a road as a pavement shared with pedestrians. This sharing can produce conflicts with pedestrians particularly families with children or animals because of their tendency to spread across the whole track. What does this mean in practice? Take for example the latest section of Mount Road from the Oak plantation to the roundabout travelling East.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Dean				Utilising the same area of road and ancillary's, with the road slightly wider, the edge to be marked to allow high speed /professional cyclists (they don't like the interruption to their steady pace which results on most cycle tracks). Splitting the cycle/pedestrian track by putting the pedestrians through the wooded areas for example and planting the borders of the cycleway to a hedge to form windbreaks reduce noise and improve the ambiance. Equally it could be the other way around. Once into the original build areas of town it is obviously more difficult to adopt this pattern but if the pedestrian and cycle ways can be given a more independent route away from the restricted areas around the roads much may be possible.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Dean				<p>With decent cycling routes how do we get them used more? One key thing is by example with as many official bodies as possible embracing cycling. For example why do nearly all council workmen have to have transport? If a litter pick is being carried out everyone can cycle to their start point, you only need a lorry to collect at the end of the shift.</p> <p>To work with cycle manufacturers to bring the prices of electric bikes down and design suitable carriers to take shopping in plastic bags. Work with supermarkets to provide cover for bicycles, secure storage and lockable containers for helmets etc, thus easing their traffic problems.</p> <p>If your live in Thurston an electric cycle would be perfect to commute if they could be purchased for say £250 or hired cheaply. Many people are actually spending £40 per week to travel by car. (Car sharing is something which has never attracted people to any extent).</p>	See above	See above
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support.	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15995	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>The trunk road network</p> <p>The Highways Agency, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, is responsible for operating, maintaining the strategic road network (SRN) in England. We have a duty to safeguard the operation of the SRN as set out in Department for Transport circular 02/2007 'Planning and the strategic road network'. The circular requires that local conditions on the SRN will be no worse with new development than if it had not taken place.</p> <p>For Bury St Edmunds, the SRN comprises the A14 trunk road. The A14 is heavily trafficked and has four junctions that serve the town: Junction 42 (Bury west) connecting with the A1302 and B1106 to the west of the town; Junction 43 (Bury central) connecting with the A134 and A143 to the north of the town; Junction 44 (Bury east) connecting with the A134 to the south of the town; and Junction 45 (Rookery) connecting with the local road serving Rougham Airfield, Suffolk Business Park and local villages.</p>	<p>The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.</p>	<p>Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			Junction 42 is not known to suffer from congestion at present. This may change once major development sites are brought forward in its vicinity. The local road at Junction 42 forms an unofficial western bypass of Bury St Edmunds, linking the A143 to the south-west of the town with the A134 and B1106 to the north. The use of this route is limited by a weight restriction at the bridge over the railway and the fact that it passes through the villages of Westley and Fornham All Saints. Development sites that provide relief roads to these villages and this bridge could result in an increase in through traffic assigning via Junction 42.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			Junction 43 is known to suffer from peak hour traffic congestion, in particular the A14 westbound off-slip road in the AM peak. A significant increase in traffic from development sites could result in deterioration of conditions at this junction and require mitigation. The roundabout at Junction 43 gives access directly into the Tesco Store car park and the British Sugar factory, which form the fifth and sixth arms of the junction. There are other roundabouts closely associated with Junction 43, namely at Compiegne Way/ A1302 Tayfen Road (400m to the south) and at A134 Compiegne Way (1 km to the north). There is a risk that queues from these junctions could tail back to the trunk road junction and adversely affect its operation.	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Junction 44 is also known to suffer from peak period traffic congestion, in particular the A14 westbound off-slip road in the AM peak. A significant increase in traffic from development sites could result in deterioration of conditions at this junction. There are a number of other roundabout junctions on the local road network close to Junction 44 that have the potential to cause queues that could tail back to the trunk road junction and adversely affect its operation. These include Rougham Hill/ Rushbrooke Lane (200m to the south-west); and Symonds Road/ Sainsbury's (100m to the north-east).</p> <p>Junction 45 is a 'compact grade separated' layout with priority T-junctions where the slip roads meet the local road. It is not known to suffer from congestion at present. The network of local roads linking the Moreton Hall area east of Bury with Junction 45 presents the risk of traffic 'rat-running' via Junction 45 to avoid congestion at Junctions 43 and 44.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>There is a relatively short weaving section (some 1.5 km) between Junctions 43 and 44. Within this section, the A14 is also signed as the route for A134 through traffic in the north-south axis. The nature of the local road network also results in this section of the A14 acting as a distributor road around the eastern side of the town, and it is believed to carry a high proportion of 'short hop' trips.</p> <p>Any modelling undertaken in connection with strategic development sites in the town will have to take account of the above issues and the potential for traffic from those developments to exacerbate them.</p> <p>West of Junction 42 and east of Junction 45, it would probably be appropriate to regard development in Bury St Edmunds at the level proposed as being part of the general background growth anticipated along the route.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Strategic growth locations</p> <p>The consultation document identifies six strategic growth locations in the outer fringes of the town: Site 1- North-west Bury St Edmunds (BV2); Site 2 - Moreton Hall (BV3); Site 3 - West Bury St Edmunds (BV4); Site 4 - North-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5); Site 5 - South-east Bury St Edmunds (BV5); and Site 6 - East of Suffolk Business Park (BV13).</p> <p>The consultation document sets out policies that will require the provision of local employment, education, community and leisure facilities, together with walking, cycling and public transport links to the town centre and other relevant destinations. This is welcomed. However, it will inevitably be the case that new residential and employment areas on the outer fringe of the town will potentially generate significant amounts of motor vehicle traffic and much of this will either use, or interface with, the A14 trunk road at some point.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Sites 1 and 3 to the west and north-west of Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Site 1 provides 900 dwellings and some local employment. This is likely to be significant in terms of its impact at A14 J42. The provision of a link road around the village of Fornham All Saints brings the possibility of traffic from other areas to the north-west of Bury reassigning to take advantage of improved access to the trunk road at Junction 42 and this should be quantified.</p> <p>Site 3 provides 450 dwellings and a site for the relocation of the West Suffolk Hospital to form a 'sub-regional health campus'. This is likely to be significant in terms of its impact at A14 J42.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>The hospital relocation brings the potential for a significant re-assignment of hospital related trips from outlying areas, focussing them on Junction 42 from a variety of different routes. The provision of a link road around the village of Westley also brings the possibility of traffic from other areas to the south-west of Bury reassigning to take advantage of the improved access to the trunk road at Junction 42 and this should be quantified.</p> <p>Sites 1 and 3 together, with their respective link roads, are likely to result in a cumulative impact at A14 Junction 42 that could include significant reassignment from other routes through the town and this should be quantified.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Sites 2 and 6 to the east of Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Site 2 represents a relatively small eastward extension of the existing residential area known as Moreton Hall. On its own, this would be of interest to the Agency in terms of its impact on A14 Junctions 44 and 45. However, its linkage in the core strategy to the provision of an Eastern Relief Road makes it inherently linked with the allocation of Site 6 and the cumulative impacts of both of these sites need to be considered.</p> <p>Site 6 (the strategic employment site to the east of Suffolk Business Park) has the potential to be significant in its own right in terms of its impact on A14 Junctions 44 and 45. However, its linkage in the core strategy to the provision of an Eastern Relief Road connecting Moreton Hall with A14 Junction 45 brings the potential for a more significant re-assignment effect. The limitations of a compact grade-separated junction at J45 make it all the more important to be able to quantify the potential increase in flows at this location.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Sites 4 and 5 to the north-east and south-east of Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>Site 4 is a larger site with a longer timeframe. It is linked in the consultation document to the provision of an A143 bypass to Great Barton and to reducing congestion at appropriate junctions on the A14 in Bury St Edmunds. The Agency welcomes the acknowledgement that a site of this size in this location may have to bring forward some mitigation measures at relevant A14 junctions. In order to determine what those measures should be, it will be important to quantify the impact of this site on the A14, particularly (but not exclusively) at Junction 43 and its impact in combination with other sites.</p> <p>Site 5 is also a larger site with a longer timeframe. It will provide a north-south link road to relieve the A134 to the south of the town. This route is shown in the site plan as connecting the A134 with Rougham Road closer to its junction with the A14 at Junction 44 than at present and this may provide a more attractive route for traffic seeking to access the A14 at this point.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>This site is also required to contribute to reducing congestion at appropriate junctions on the A14 in Bury St Edmunds. The impact of this site on the A14, particularly (but not exclusively) at Junction 44, and the reassignment effects of the A134 link road must therefore be quantified.</p> <p>The allocation of Sites 4 and 5 together brings the probability of an increase in north-south cross-town traffic, which could give rise to an increase in 'short-hop' trips along the A14 between junctions 43 & 44. The potential for this effect should be quantified.</p> <p>Strategic sites - conclusion</p> <p>The promoters of each of these sites will be required to provide a robust and comprehensive transport assessment. However, it is the Agency's view that the scale and complexity of the development proposed requires a strategic assessment of the sites in combination to identify their cumulative impact on the trunk road, together with their potential to give rise to wider re-assignment effects, such as those described above.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Traffic modelling work undertaken to date</p> <p>The Agency is aware of two modelling exercises that have been undertaken in respect of development sites in Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>The first was a spreadsheet-based assessment carried out by AECOM in early 2009 on behalf of Suffolk County Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council in support of the local development framework core strategy. This comprised a series of rather simplistic spreadsheet-based trip generation and distribution models aimed at illustrating the potential level of additional traffic likely to result from each of the sites then being considered. The sites considered at that stage have many similarities with those now being consulted upon, but there has been a significant amount of refinement of options in the period since that earlier work was undertaken.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>The spreadsheet models themselves had a number of limitations. In particular, they specifically excluded consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantifying the cumulative impact of sites coming forward in combination. • Quantifying re-assignment effects either due to increasing congestion or due to the provision of link roads such as those referred to in the Vision 2031 document. • Quantifying the impact of land-uses other than residential in the trip generations. <p>The work carried out by AECOM during 2009 must therefore be seen as an exercise in providing evidence for a 'first sift' of potential core strategy options. It cannot be seen as sufficient to provide evidence to take the options now being consulted on forward to the next stage.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>The second exercise was undertaken by consultants acting on behalf of a consortium of developers to the east of Bury St Edmunds, comprising the promoters of Sites 2, 4 and 5 above. A programme of data collection was undertaken during June 2011. This was seen as appropriate to the needs of the three developers acting in consortium. Since the St Edmundsbury Borough Council led meeting in September 2011 with developers, Suffolk County Council, AECOM and the Agency, it is unclear to what extent attempts to interest the promoters of the remaining sites in a 'town-wide model' have progressed.</p> <p>In the light of this, the Agency considers there is a further stage to be undertaken between the publication of the consultation document and the point at which developers start bringing forward planning applications for sites within the development areas.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>A modelling exercise with the objective of quantifying the cumulative impacts of sites and re-assignment effects would be of great benefit in terms of providing reassurance that the impact on the trunk road (and the local highway network) of the pattern of development proposed has been properly quantified and any necessary mitigation identified. It could also then be used by individual developers as a common basis on which to construct the more detailed analysis required in the transport assessments for the individual sites. The Agency supports the council's aim within paragraph 7.19 of the consultation document to encourage all the developers of the strategic sites to work together with the council and the highway authorities to assess the impact on the road network and identify acceptable mitigation.</p> <p>A specification note for such a model was provided by AECOM to the developers, St Edmundsbury Borough Council, Suffolk County Council and the Agency on 3rd October 2011.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Non strategic sites</p> <p>Residential</p> <p>The non strategic residential sites at Station Hill (BV8) and Tayfen Road (BV9) could potentially have a significant impact on the trunk road given their proximity to it and likelihood to generate a large amount of trips, a high proportion of which is likely to interact with the trunk road. The Agency would expect to be involved in the planning process for these sites, including the scoping of the transport assessments.</p> <p>The sites at Garden Centre, Rougham Road (BV10) and Ram Meadow (BV11) are likely to have a minor impact on the A14 trunk road. The Agency would expect to be consulted on the transport assessments for these sites.</p> <p>The other non strategic residential sites identified in the consultation document are likely to have only a negligible impact on the trunk road.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Employment</p> <p>The non strategic employment sites at Suffolk Business Park (BV14) and Bury St Edmunds Retail Park (BV17) could potentially have a significant impact on the trunk road given their proximity to it and likelihood to generate a large amount of trips, a high proportion of which is likely to interact with the trunk road. The Agency would expect to be involved in the planning process for these sites, including the scoping of the transport assessments.</p> <p>The sites at Blenheim Park, Chapel Pond Hill, Eastern Way, Mildenhall Hall Road, and Northern Way (all in BV14) are likely to have a minor impact on the A14 trunk road. The Agency would expect to be consulted on the transport assessments for these sites.</p> <p>The other non strategic employment sites identified in the consultation document are likely to have only a negligible impact on the trunk road.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Overall impact on the trunk road</p> <p>The Agency's assessment of the non-strategic housing and employment sites indicates that A14 Junctions 43 and 44 have the most potential for being affected by the impact of proposed growth. Although there are no 'showstoppers' in terms of any individual site that could cause major implications for the trunk road, the cumulative impact on the trunk road could be quite substantial. It is therefore important that any modelling of the strategic sites acknowledges the cumulative impact of the non strategic sites.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<p>Conclusions</p> <p>The Agency would expect the promoters of each of the strategic sites to produce a robust and comprehensive transport assessment. The Agency would also expect to be consulted at the scoping stage in the development of these assessments.</p> <p>The Agency believes there is a strong case for a strategic town-wide traffic assignment model to be produced. The rationale for this includes:</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to consider the cumulative impact of multiple sites brought forward either together or in sequence. • The need to consider the mitigation required to support this cumulative impact. • The need to consider re-assignment effects, particularly due to the association of some of these sites with the provision of link roads providing relief to existing problem locations. • The existence of historic congestion problems at A14 Junctions 43 and 44 and on the local road network in the vicinity of these junctions. • The existence of a short weaving section between Junctions 43 and 44 together with a pattern of development that may generate 'short-hop' trips between these two junctions. • The compact grade separated layout at A14 Junction 45 (which may be less resilient to growth than a conventional layout) together with an Eastern Relief Road that would tend to focus traffic on this junction. 	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gary Chisman	The Highways Agency			The Agency has not identified any non strategic sites that are likely to be 'show stopper'. However, the cumulative impact of the non-strategic sites should be acknowledged in any modelling undertaken for the strategic sites.	See above	See above
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	Increase train capacity. Increase bus timetable times from villages to BSE Monday to Sunday inclusive. Increase need of community spirit i.e. too many supermarkets.	Thank you for your comments. The themes discussed are supported throughout section 7 of this document. The details for implementation are not within the remit of this document.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Encourage visitors and local shoppers by keeping car parking charges as low as possible.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Yes, but it must be kept in mind that travel is needed for getting to work and leisure	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	No. Proposed actions at 7.6 are totally inadequate. Nothing less than a fully organised and funded public transport service (i.e. buses) will do. Villages such as Barrow, Thurston, Great Barton etc cannot be serviced by people walking or cycling into town	Thank you for your comments. Rural Vision 2031 shall address transport issues for villages in the rural area.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has and will continue to work with St Edmundsbury BC to further develop transport strategies that ensure that the transport implications of this significant level of growth will be mitigated. Bury St Edmunds is identified as a strategic town within the council's Local Transport Plan. The aim of this plan is to support a prosperous and vibrant economy, tackle congestion and encourage the use of sustainable transport, in particular for short and local journeys. Approximately £1.2million capital investment, for the period 2011-2015, has been allocated to Bury St Edmunds to provide schemes that support the aims of the LTP.	The Council welcomes the support from Suffolk County Council.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>However, this funding is not sufficient to cover the costs of all schemes needed in Bury St Edmunds and there will be a requirement for the strategic development sites to mitigate their impact and fund schemes that provide improvements to support the aims of the LTP, that would be required to make the developments acceptable, for example sustainable access both within the sites and connecting into the town centre.</p> <p>The county council welcomes the reference to improving walking and cycling links, especially in 7.4.3 and 7.6. With documents referring to footways, cycleways and public rights of way, we would suggest that it would be useful to be precise in the use of terminology, in order to cover all types of routes which enable safer and easier walking and cycling. Instead, the borough council may wish to refer to 'public rights of way and permissive paths' in order to ensure that all types of route are included in the definition.</p>	The Council agrees with the County Council's comments relating to public rights of way.	Amend section to ensure consistency of terminology. Refer to public rights of way and permissive paths.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>Pedestrian and cycling improvements from the villages close to the town into the town, would need to be facilitated as part of the strategic developments around Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>On aspiration 2 SCC supports the implementation of real-time bus service information within urban areas to encourage greater use of these services on principle. The council plans to introduce RPTI (real time passenger information) into the western area around Bury St Edmunds in the medium term, once stability is demonstrated for town and urban bus service provision. Aspiration 2 (doing what is feasible to make public transport around the town and borough reliable and cheap) is a worthy aim. However, in the shorter term the borough must be aware that public transport services around Bury St. Edmunds are mainly operated as fully commercial services.</p>	The Council welcomes the support relating to real time passenger information.	Amend - add a sentence to paragraph 7.7 to highlight that bus services are operated as a commercial service.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>Operators are facing significant cost pressures (fuel) and cuts in government subsidies (Bus Service Operators Grant) over the next 2-3 years. This might have an impact on the fares they set, the regularity of services offered and the stability of provision.</p> <p>The borough and county council (as Passenger Transport Authority) will need to have discussions with the commercial operators as to whether they think offering more direct and/or circular bus routes in Bury will increase patronage. If the outcomes of these discussions are positive, then a case might be able to be made for inserting these routes and extending the bus station. However, any new or changed routes are most likely to be established on a commercial basis.</p>	The comments are noted and the council will continue to work with relevant bodies around the delivery of passenger travel around the town	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>SCC will continue to use its Strategic Rail Policy Group to make the case to Greater Anglia Ltd for the implementation of more cycle storage capacity at Bury St. Edmunds Railway Station and the improvement of cycle access to the station site. Schemes to improve access from the train station to the town centre have been identified in the current LTP programme. SCC will continue to work with all public sector establishments within Bury St. Edmunds and with major private sector employers to introduce sustainable travel plans, and also aims to introduce one for Bury St. Edmunds Railway Station. Aspiration 4 (a): Lobby for improvements on the A14 and access routes to it from the town SCC are working with SEBC and the Highways Agency to assess the impacts of the strategic developments on the A14 and the access from junctions 42, 43, 44 and 45 and push for improvements.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the work being undertaken by Suffolk County Council as it will support the delivery of the travel aspirations</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>SCC is also aware of the requirements by SEBC to provide relief roads as part of the strategic development sites. The council are currently working closely with SEBC on transport issues relating to the strategic development sites around the town.</p> <p>Aspiration 4 (b): Safeguard primary road corridors in the town to ensure that congestion on these routes is minimised</p> <p>The council has identified the need for the introduction of a UTMC (urban traffic management & control) system on the primary road corridors around the town to enable the effective management of traffic and to minimise the impact of congestion. This work would need to consider the impact of the strategic developments around the town to be effective.</p>	The Council welcomes the work being undertaken by Suffolk County Council as it will support the delivery of the travel aspirations	No changes required
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>Aspiration 4 (c): Lobby for improvement of the rail link (s) to Cambridge and London</p> <p>SCC is aware of the need to improve rail links between Bury and Cambridge to take strategic traffic off of the A14 and give commuters another option for travel to Cambridge. SCC shall continue to use its position as the lead body within the Suffolk Rail Policy Group to lobby the franchise holders about the improvements customers want to see.</p>	The Council welcomes this support.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that improvements to the capacity of local junctions on the A14 are crucial to facilitate the growth and continued well being of the town. However, the Society considers it essential to reduce the need and desire to use the private car by ensuring all new growth is in the form of mixed use developments to minimise the need to travel to access services and employment. This is the foundation of sustainable urbanism.	Thank you for your comments which are supported in this document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments) This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications.		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). They need to be modified. Increasing the towns population by 13,000 will make the aspirations much harder to achieve. There are number of good points in the aspirations but whilst it is admirable to promote the use of cycling, walking and public transport, in reality the car will still play a major role in transport. We are a rural town and the provision of public transport in many areas is inadequate to meet need. Cycling and walking routes are fine but the roads need improving, even without the proposed expansion of the Town. Much, if not all, of the provision for public transport, rail and major road improvements is out of the hands of the Council and it will have to lobby central government for major improvements. Many towns have been expanded without infrastructure improvements, with disastrous effect.	Thank you for your support. The issues raised are addressed as aspirations throughout the document and detailed proposals shall be considered as part of any future applications for large scale development.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			Little or no development should therefore go ahead until all the travel requirements and related infrastructure, roads, rail, public transport etc. are in place or at least guaranteed to be provided when demanded.	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	BUT (again) consider Park and Ride as a permanent feature - not just at Christmas.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			no	No, existing problems not being resolved now.	Thank you for your comment. This document seeks to address areas of concern.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short				No. Congestion must be reduced by encouraging use of alternatives. Speed limits on our roads must be reduced to 20mph more widely so people feel safe to cycle and walk. Rail link to Sudbury must be developed/reinstated (=a better route to London etc).	Thank you for your comment. The provision of alternative travel options is supported throughout the document. The details on how this is to be provided is not within the remit of the document but would be assessed in detail	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	No. Upgrading the link to London would turn this into a commuter town pushing up house prices for locals residents.	Thank you for your comments. Aspirations that support the local economy seek to ensure that future development retains adequate employment within the Town to limit the need for commuting. Affordable housing is also a priority for the council that shall be addressed separately.	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Cars should be appreciated & accommodated & traffic flow better managed...council has created this chaos & cannot be trusted again what is written is NOT what will happen!	Thank you for your comment. The support of alternative travel options where feasible is expected to help ease congestion for car users.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes	Overall, yes. Please consider 'hoppa bus" routes round the town and there must be a Park and Ride Service.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Agree but Difficult to see how it will work in practice. Will not be able to discourage car use - Bury serves a rural hinterland. Cycle routes currently are almost pointless.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Important that the Traffic Study is released for public comment before too long. Will people give up their cars ?	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	They are a step in the right direction. I would recommend consideration be given to a permanent park and ride scheme	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		Noted	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough				ACTION IN ROAD IMPROVEMENTS / CONSTRUCTION NEEDS TO HAPPEN AND NOT JUST TALKED ABOUT. ALL ROAD WORK DONE PRIOR TO BUILD	It is the building which funds the infrastructure improvements so it is not viable for this to take place first.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no	You have no plan to actually solve the traffic congestion within Bury. A radical review should be made and a park and ride is the only answer to reduce the amount of traffic coming into the centre of Bury.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	It is a major culture change for people to give up the habit of a generation in depending on private transport and this will only happen when the public transport system provides a real alternative and safe cycle ways and walk ways are constructed. Considerable improvements are needed before that position is reached. Consideration should also be given to additional rail halts to access the town. Priority should be given to 'green' travel measures which are essential to reduce carbon emissions as well as reduce congestion.	The Council recognises that real public transport alternatives need to be provided and supports green travel measures.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	Give priority and funding to resolve the issue in para. 7.21, sort out access from A14. Consider providing Park & Ride or Park & Share facilities.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	The aspirations are good but are not truly achieved with this plan. Components must be integrated with funds from developers - no funding no further building	Thank you for your comments. Any future development would be assessed in relation to its ability to satisfy the aspirations and the details of the application.	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	Priority needs to be given and funding provided to resolve the issue in para. 7.21, poor access from A14 needs to be resolved. Consider providing Park & Ride or Park & Share facilities.	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21698E	Stephen Mills	Churchgate Area Association		yes	<p>As the CAA represents residents and businesses in the heart of the historic grid in Bury St Edmunds, travel into the town is centre is important to us. We feel that there are no real provisions in this document to cope with the increased traffic that would be an inevitable result of the significant plans for additional housing contained in Vision 31. With a proposed increase in the population of BSE due to the plans for an additional 6,000 new houses there are no significant plans as to how to cope with this. In particular</p> <p>There is no provision for additional parking in and around the town centre.</p> <p>It is unrealistic to assume that people from rural areas will want, or be able to travel into the town without the use of a private car.</p>	<p>The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.</p>	<p>Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21698E	Stephen Mills	Churchgate Area Association			<p>As we know the provision of public transport, particularly buses is in decline, and therefore using public transport is not going to currently be an option for people wanting to come into town for shopping. There has to be a plan for increased local bus services which are cheap, reliable and frequent if people are going to be encouraged to use this service.</p> <p>Improving walking and cycling routes is a welcome aspiration but again this will not be an option for many people wanting to do their shopping in the town. Particularly as the document states that by 2031 over 25% of the local population will be 65 or older for whom cycling or walking is not an option.</p>	The Council agrees that reliable public transport options are required. Bus operators work on a commercial basis, but with colleagues in Suffolk County Council, to develop sustainable routes.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21698E	Stephen Mills	Churchgate Area Association			<p>We feel that there should be a strategy in place for the provision of a Park & Ride scheme for the town to ensure that private car travel into the town centre is reduced.</p> <p>With the existing road layout of the town centre being fixed with little flexibility to improve the town centre road layout, there is bound to be additional congestion in the town. This document does not contain any precise plans as to how to alleviate this. The document speaks about introducing measures that would help manage the flow of traffic around the town. However no specific measures are discussed. As you state in the document parts of Bury St Edmunds already suffer from congestion at peak times and this can only get worse without specific measures to alleviate the amount of traffic coming into the town.</p>	Recent evidence on viability has shown that the town could not currently support a park and ride site. However this will be kept under review and this could be implemented at a later date without the need to review the Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes	<p>Promoting public transport and cycling are good ideas, BUT:</p> <p>There would need to be dedicated cycle paths between all sections of the town, avoiding the need to cycle on roads at all.</p> <p>Beware of developing a 'We hate cars' attitude which the likes of Cambridge seem to have.</p> <p>People will always want their own personal transport unless the alternatives (public transport) are spectacularly efficient and cheap.</p> <p>Park & Ride is good, but it must be cheap and fast (maybe a shuttle train instead of buses).</p> <p>By all means try to get people to use other means of transport around Bury, but do it by making the alternatives attractive, not by making car use difficult and expensive.</p>	The Council agrees that attractive public transport alternatives need to be provided.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	The aspirations are absolute tosh! 7.17 sums it up. You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. You won't solve Bury's traffic problems by changing the roads. If you make flyovers, you will ruin Bury. Terry Clements as much as said what there is, is what there will be in future. Thus, if it can't be improved, and everyone agrees it is less than adequate now, why why suggest that the system can cope with another 6000 plus souls on the road in cars, or even on the busses? That dog don't hunt.	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section
	Elizabeth Hodder				In 2009 I was unable to drive for a year owing to a medical disability. I used the busses to get to and from work, in Guildhall Street. It was less than satisfactory. I either had to arrive at the crack of dawn, or late. I had to leave before the end of the working day, or well after the end of the working day. Standing about at Fornham all Saints waiting for a bus in bitter wind, rain and snow, is not something that people will do unless (like me) they have no choice.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Elizabeth Hodder				<p>I cycled in the summer months to avoid the problem of poor timetabling. No one who works in an office and has to wear a business suit will cycle in the winter, and sit in soggy clothes all day with wet rat hair. It just won't happen.</p> <p>If you build 3 - 4 bedroom houses, you will sell them from £300,000 upwards. Folk who can afford huge mortgages to buy such a house, will not be cycling to work, because they will probably be working in Cambridge or Norwich or even London. Thus, their cars will be on the roads.</p> <p>I agree your aspirations, but you have no viable plans to deliver them.</p>	Noted - the delivery plans will provide more details as to how these aspirations will be delivered.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptekeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank your for responding.	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 23: Travel aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 23a Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 23b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes	Making use of the previously proposed Moreton Hall railway Halt Station to ease congestion at and to the main town railway station should be considered within the period. This would give better rail access to Moreton Hall and its employment area.	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	The improvement of the A14 is a must for the development of the North East and South East sites. The Eastern Relief Road is a must for the Moreton Hall development whether business or residential. These requirements are Core Strategy objectives and MUST be implemented prior to ANY development	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document. The council will continue to work with the developers of the strategic sites and relevant highways authorities through the masterplan stage and delivery of the sites.	Reference to the junction assessment work has been made in the travel section
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	The Society supports the section on sustainable energy. However, we consider that there should be a more holistic view of sustainability - including criteria such as carbon consumption, water consumption, transport infrastructure, health and well-being and specification of building materials. The document should also call for specific standards - at least Code 4 as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. By integrating quantifiable carbon targets within a wider reaching sustainable strategy, responsibility will be shared between the local authority and developers.	Further policy requirements are contained in the emerging Development Management Policies document which should be read alongside the Vision 2031 document	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	<p>The requirement for developers to deliver only 6Kg CO2/m2/yr is significantly in excess of the Government's 'Zero Carbon Homes Standards' (see attached schematic) which stipulates that by definition a Detached Zero carbon home's DER should be 10Kg, an Attached Dwelling 11Kg and a Low Rise Flat Block 14Kg. As such, Policy BV18 vastly exceeds the standards and expectations of Government.</p> <p>Whilst the standards that the Government sets can be achieved there is a financial implication in doing so. Currently most houses built to 2010 Building Regulations / Specifications and 2009 SAP will as a result produce between 15Kg - 19 KgCO2/m²/yr. The equivalent figure for flats is approximately 20KgCO2/m²/yr.</p>	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Therefore in order to get a typical detached dwelling down to a figure of 10Kg CO₂/m²/yr would require construction to typical 2010 specification plus the addition of 1.60 Kwp of photovoltaic panels. This is achievable but will add approximately £4,000 to the cost of the dwelling.</p> <p>To get a typical dwelling down to a figure of 6Kg CO₂/m²/yr would imply construction at 2010 specification plus a number of alternative supplementary measures. For example the dwelling would need 4.10 Kwp of PV plus a community heating system. This is unlikely to be achievable given the roof area of a typical detached house. Using methods such as widening the cavity width and providing dual lintels (rather than breaching the cavity) will help reduce the DER's CO₂, (thus reducing the amount of PV needed). External walls could be increased to 340mm with a 3.25 Kwp PV system - but again this is unlikely to fit with the available roof area.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Mid Terrace dwellings under the Carbon Compliance standard are nationally targeted to produce 11Kg CO2/m²/yr and to achieve this will require a minimum of 1.0 Kwp of PV. However, if a 6Kg target were to be applied to this type of accommodation, PV of at least 2.4Kwp would be needed, which cannot be provided given the roof area - even covering both front and back aspects. Delivering the policy target for flats is unlikely to be achievable without off site interventions.</p> <p>Overall, achieving a 6Kg target for all dwellings irrespective of type is not likely to be practically achievable. It will require both on and off site technologies which will have a very significant effect of build costs and the practical effect is that development will not occur.</p> <p>Another alternative might be an 'off site contribution' as referenced in the Carbon Compliance Standard as an 'Allowable Solution'.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		Viability of development is a major issue across most of East Anglia and to render development viable with exceptional additional construction costs will mean that other desirable planning obligations such as affordable homes, education and community development charges will have to be significantly reduced. No significant increase in revenue is anticipated in the foreseeable future which will alter this position and therefore planning for CO2 emissions of almost half the national requirement will have a significant effect on the deliverability of homes and on the ability of the Council to secure planning obligations in respect of other matters.	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>There are no justifications given in the Plan or in any other guidance that determines why a lower target has been set, which considers its implications and distinguishes the need for target levels in St Edmundsbury that are significantly lower than national requirements. Moreover NPPF paragraph 95 states that 'when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standard'.</p> <p>Therefore in the absence of any reasoned or reasonable local justification, and where the effect of such targets is likely to have a significant adverse effect on the delivery of development, economic growth and social cohesion, we require that this policy be deleted and replaced with targets reflecting national aspirations.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Should be a policy on small scale energy generation too i.e. on a per home basis.	Housebuilding can be more or less sustainable in its use of resources and lifetime energy consumption. We should be aiming for the more sustainable end of the spectrum. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	<p>We agree with the proposed actions for the achievement of resource efficiency, particularly the requirement for the developers to take account of the lifetime impact of their development.</p> <p>As well as ensuring low energy carbon suppliers and high levels of efficiency in energy use, it is important that all new build adopts construction methods that reduce the need for heating within buildings. Water conservation and the efficiency in the use of water should be high priorities for all new build developments.</p> <p>The use of waste energy through a district heating initiative is welcomed alongside other locally available renewable energy sources.</p>	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	All other low carbon and low energy options mentioned in the document are welcomed, including transport policies. Encouragement for householders to reduce private car use is a priority but can only be achieved by the introduction of comprehensive public transport including both buses and trains. For instance, priority should be given to an additional rail halt(s), as have been considered in the past.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the aspirations towards on-site low carbon energy but emphasise the importance within the Policy of the 'where feasible and viable' proviso. The policy needs to be flexible in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The practicality of low carbon technologies with respect to particular site conditions. 2.The suitability of technologies in terms of landscape impact, designing in context and visual amenity. 3.The financial viability of technologies in both capital and revenue terms. 4.The cost benefit appeal of technologies against other sustainability alternatives. <p>The policy should also provide flexibility in terms of off-site solutions that may provide economies of scale and more cost efficient impacts overall</p>	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While in principle we support the underlying thinking behind the aspirations for sustainability and climate change, we note that the issues addressed, and policies defined in this section are inextricably linked with policies related to Sustainable Growth, Development and Design Principles in Section 3 of the Development Management Policies Preferred Options Document. Having not dissimilar polices in the two documents is thoroughly confusing and we urge the Borough to integrate the material in the two plans into a single clear document.	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no	See attached PDF	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	Stringent CO2 emission targets for new developments already exist under the building regulations. New homes built under the 2006 Building Regulations were 20% more energy efficient than those built under the 2002 Regulations. The 2012 Building Regulations result in a 25% improvement compared to 2006, and changes due in 2013 are likely to require a 44% improvement compared to 2006 (equivalent to a 55% reduction compared to a house built under the Building Regulations 2002). By 2016 a 100% improvement compared to 2006 is likely to be in place. We agree that climate change is the greatest threat facing mankind and that urgent action is needed. However, such action is already being taken by Government and the development industry is already is already on a highly challenging timetable to deliver zero carbon homes by 2016.	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>The approach in BV18 toward emissions levels and district heating is not justified - there is no evidence based document setting out how the council arrived at the policy or considering the implications.</p> <p>In order to address climate change, the key action the authority should be taking is to deliver significant major renewable capacity across the District rather than relying on the provision through new development. We do not agree that opportunities for large scale low carbon energy generation are limited. There is significant capacity to introduce other technologies.</p> <p>The NPPF requires that careful attention be paid to viability and costs in plan-making (para 173) and that local authorities should set out policies on local standards in their plans and assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards (para 174).</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>There appears to be no assessment of the cost implications of the policy of the impact that could have on the delivery of development and therefore the approach can not be said to accord with the NPPF.</p> <p>During the Bury St Edmunds Decentralised Energy Study, Countryside raised the following material points, and accordingly these matters are reiterated here:</p> <p>Why does the Policy propose targeting a 70% trajectory - when this has been proven to be unsound, and contradicts the Housing Minister's announcements with regards to the zero carbon definition?</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>The Carbon Compliance (CC) Task Group found that the previous Government proposal from July 2009, to tighten the CC standard from 2016 by 70% (equivalent to 6kg CO₂(eq)/m²/year), was not achievable in all but the exception cases, and/or where money was no object.</p> <p>Therefore it was recommended that the "as built performance" (this is very challenging) emissions from new homes should not exceed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10kg CO₂(eq)/m²/year for detached houses (the % improvements on the 2006 standard would be 60% for detached houses) • 11kg CO₂/m²/year for other houses (56% for other houses) • 14kg CO₂(eq)/m²/year for low rise apartment blocks (44% for low rise apartment blocks which equals CSH4) 	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		Countryside is keen that the comments that are in the policy are consistent and are underpinned with an up to date knowledge and government policy. We regard to the North West Bury St Edmunds option, an 1689tCO2 pa savings is welcome, equivalent to 0.13% of the boroughs emissions but not at any cost and when a dwelling-centric solution can provide the same benefits, but without the additional cost/risks. Hence as Countryside has stated before, a dwelling centric-approach topped up with Allowable Solutions is the most pragmatic outcome going forward.	See above	See above
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	More use of solar energy use on new buildings - homes and industrial units.	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the proactive approach being taken toward delivery of district heating schemes and would be interested in working with you to gain learning on the delivery of such infrastructure. The policy makes reference to district heating opportunity areas, and paragraph 8.10 says that opportunity areas have been identified. It might be helpful, in the final version of this document, to include maps of where these areas are. A good example is the London Borough of Islington, which has presented its information on district heating schemes in the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan particularly effectively.	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	On site carbon energy targets are difficult to robustly calculate and hence police. Instead existing standards (Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM) are more universally understood. Whilst the Society is very supportive of the aims of this policy, it is perhaps difficult to apply?	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>				See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Opportunities for sustainable renewable energy are only limited by mindset and by policy. There are numerous alternative energy systems we could install; small scale (eg solar) and large scale (eg biogas). We must plan for a wholesale transition to sustainable energy and fossil fuels are not sustainable.	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Impractical, overhyped and too expensive	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Sounds great but unachievable & again council cannot be trusted.	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Development has to be profitable for developers so a balance has to be struck. Great in theory doubtful in practice.	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	We support all that is proposed particularly the need for developers to take account of the lifetime energy impact of their development. As well as ensuring low carbon energy supplies and high levels of efficiency in energy use it is important that all new build adopts construction methods that reduce the need for heating within buildings. Water conservation and efficiency of use should also have high priority in all building developments.	The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		The support is welcomed, however, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 24: On-site Low Carbon Energy Target (BV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV18?	Question 24b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	It is far too weak (where viable and feasible" Developers will always say it is not!	More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy BV18

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	Keep it simple	No explanation is provided to support this statement	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	The Society supports the section on sustainable energy. However, we consider that there should be a more holistic view of sustainability including criteria such as carbon consumption, water consumption, transport infrastructure, health and well-being and specification of building materials. The document should also call for specific standards - at least Code 4 as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. By integrating quantifiable carbon targets within a wider reaching sustainable strategy, responsibility will be shared between the local authority and developers.	This support is welcomed. The other suggested energy sources are addressed in the Development Management Document.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	<p>Whilst we note that Policy BV19 only states that strategic development sites should consider installing a district heating network to serve the site unless it can be shown not to be feasible or viable we object to the implication that district heating should be the starting point unless demonstrated otherwise.</p> <p>Heat is presently unregulated. Whereas the consumer presently has a choice of supplier for gas and electricity a district heating network would represent a captive supply which does not give the consumer any competitive choice over hot water for domestic use or central heating. There are therefore regulatory issues surrounding the provision of district heating systems in relation to the requirements of the energy regulator and also the requirements of the Council for Mortgage Lenders. This affects both the initial sale of the property and to subsequent resales.</p>	The policy has been strengthened by changing 'recommended' to 'required' and recognises that district heating network opportunity areas will be identified in an SPD. Although viability, feasibility and deliverability are a core element of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), they do not need to be incorporated into the policy.	Policy amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		Until Government clarifies the regulatory position, widespread implementation of district heating systems for private homes is unlikely to be deliverable in England. It would not be viable to fit houses with both a district heating network and heat exchanger and a conventional gas supply and gas boiler. This would add significantly to the cost of a dwelling and be unlikely to be recouped in any savings to the customer in fuel costs. Moreover without a gas supply residents would be denied the opportunity of gas for cooking and the more resident opting for gas in these circumstances the less viable it would be to operate a district heating system. As other thermal retention criteria are increased through the CfSH and Building Regulations, the demand for heat is also likely to continue diminishing over time thereby also calling into question the operational viability of a district network.	See above	Policy amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>We note the government's intentions to extend the Renewable Heat Incentive to domestic properties and a forthcoming consultation following the extension of the Renewable Heat Premium Payment to householders in 2011. It would appear that Government incentives are being targeted on individual properties rather than supporting or encouraging district networks. Therefore we consider that any policy that seeks to prioritise centralised heat provision may be premature until the full range and extent of national policy is established.</p> <p>Developers should therefore be free to assess what technologies are technically feasible and which meet regulatory requirements in order to achieve appropriate carbon reduction targets</p>	See above	Policy amended
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	<p>We agree with the proposed actions for the achievement of resource efficiency, particularly the requirement for the developers to take account of the lifetime impact of their development.</p> <p>As well as ensuring low energy carbon suppliers and high levels of efficiency in energy use, it is important that all new build adopts construction methods that reduce the need for heating within buildings. Water conservation and the efficiency in the use of water should be high priorities for all new build developments.</p> <p>The use of waste energy through a district heating initiative is welcomed alongside other locally available renewable energy sources.</p> <p>All other low carbon and low energy options mentioned in the document are welcomed, including transport policies.</p>	This support is welcomed and the comments made are reflected in the actions and aspirations in the document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	Encouragement for householders to reduce private car use is a priority but can only be achieved by the introduction of comprehensive public transport including both buses and trains. For instance, priority should be given to an additional rail halt(s), as have been considered in the past.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the aspirations towards district heating but again emphasise the importance of targets being applied flexibly against considerations of practical site and development feasibility as well as financial viability - for example, in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The durability of supply and the cost of backup supply arrangements. 2. The relationship between the supplier and the customer as well as competition in supply. 3. Achieving the necessary combined load profiling between residential and commercial. 4. Initial capital outlay, payback certainty and periods. 5. Comparison with alternative technologies and opportunities for achieving carbon reduction. 	The policy has been strengthened by changing 'recommended' to 'required' and recognises that district heating network opportunity areas will be identified in an SPD. Although viability, feasibility and deliverability are a core element of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), they do not need to be incorporated into the policy.	Policy amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While in principle we support the underlying thinking behind the aspirations for sustainability and climate change, we note that the issues addressed, and policies defined in this section are inextricably linked with policies related to Sustainable Growth, Development and Design Principles in Section 3 of the Development Management Policies Preferred Options Document. Having not dissimilar polices in the two documents is thoroughly confusing and we urge the Borough to integrate the material in the two plans into a single clear document.	The support is welcomed. The Local Plan consists of a number of documents which complement and support each other.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Very expensive to install. It has not worked in London.	No explanation is provided to support this statement	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	<p>The District Heating Network Opportunity Areas appear to be defined on the Proposals Map and the Council's evidence study does not appear to be available on the internet. The approach needs to be supported by evidence to enable meaningful comments to be made.</p> <p>The NPPF requires that careful attention be paid to viability and costs in plan-making (para 173) and that local authorities should set out policies on local standards in their plans and assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards (para 174). There appears to be no assessment of the cost implications of the policy or the impact that could have on the delivery of development and therefore the approach can not be said to accord with the NPPF.</p>	The policy has been strengthened by changing 'recommended' to 'required' and recognises that district heating network opportunity areas will be identified in an SPD. Although viability, feasibility and deliverability are a core element of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), they do not need to be incorporated into the policy.	Policy amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>With further reference to Bury St Edmunds Decentralised Energy Study, without Bury St Edmunds' leadership, commitment and future investment in more detailed studies the potential of fulfilling any of the recommendations in the Report (and consequently the proposed policies) are arguably at best challenging or not possible.</p> <p>For example, our preference for a dwelling-centric regulatory compliant approach is hugely challenging, whilst a site-wide approach is even more difficult and expensive. Without the collaboration of landowners and the many identified commercial organisations, Premier foods etc it is difficult to see how the Reports initial proposals and the proposed policy might be developed let alone enabled. A multi-stakeholder transformation programme of this nature is incredibly innovative and will require significant leadership and collaboration expertise and of course investments in time, resource and capital.</p>	The Bury Energy Study forms background evidence to support the policy. The points made are noted and the issues considered during the production of a future SPD.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>The fact of the matter remains, there are many physical, environmental and socio-economic constraints to work through - is there an appetite and the funding and resources to do this next stage of the required work? What will be the extra/over costs and impacts upon the critical path of housing delivery and the wider economic benefits development brings?</p> <p>Additionally the application of Allowable Solutions (AS) will provide a more affective and importantly a more socially inclusive solution, whereby the monies provided can be used to upgrade existing homes. Rather than connecting non-energy efficient existing homes/buildings to a wholly more expensive district wide infrastructure. In the first instance 'fuel poverty' should be reduced through a fabric-first (dwelling-centric) solution and thereafter through AS.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>Our principle observations are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land ownership and CPO, and the consequential impacts on housing delivery and the incalculable costs of such delays, must be factored into the financial appraisals. 2. Physical (plus socio-economic) site barriers/constraints of providing infrastructure from British Sugar to the 1st and 2nd legs of the proposed pipes and thereafter the final leg to the Development site, needs far more /£ appraisal. 3. The costs and commercial risks of the Developers site networks are not factored in to the Â£ appraisal, the Zero Carbon Hubs work on Carbon Compliance (countryside Properties sat on its Task Group) notes that a district solution is between 50% and 100% more expensive to comply with the same carbon target as a dwelling-centric solution. 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>The LA must champion the infrastructure. but as the Chamber of Commerce noted by way of example (at the previous workshop), Premier Foods (an anchor) are not members of the chamber, so realistically how might they be encouraged to participate in an even more complex and participatory co-operative (membership)?</p> <p>5. The zero carbon definition recognises on and near site carbon abatement, but there is no clarity on options such as British Sugar ebbing much further away. Accordingly a developer might be at risk by considering/connecting to the proposed infrastructure. And perversely may fail to meet other planning (the Code for Sustainable Homes/BREAAM) and regulatory (Building Regulations Part L1 & 2) requirements set out in the 2031 Vision.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>6. The Zero carbon Hubs work to date proves that Fabric Efficiency Standard (FEES) and Allowable Solutions (AS) provide the best value solution to meeting carbon abatement targets. Carbon Compliance which includes side wide infrastructure, CHP etc is far more expensive by comparison, for the same amount of carbon. Surely AS should be used to pump prime the upgrade of neighbouring properties, reducing fuel poverty and enabling community cohesion through transparent and simple mechanisms.</p> <p>Or monies might be paid into a Community Energy Fund or the Green Investment Bank (this idea needs qualifying by DECC) to see fund an appropriate infrastructure such as option 2. The proposed infrastructure requires upfront capital outlay before the Developer achieves an income, which again will affect viabilities etc. particularly in an era without affordable housing grant or indeed other forms of funding.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>7. New homes will need very limited heat a problem for CHP schemes, see Community Energy: Planning, Development and Delivery Report that LDA co-authored - in fairness to LDA and Invents, this position has been raised by them during this feasibility study on various occasions, and is also widely recognised in various reports on such infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, water-heating carbon abatement (and customer bills) can be greatly reduced by using solar technologies. Which also benefit from ROCs or depending on Government policy, which are the customer/end-user offer is far less preferable than the preferred and more cost effective dwelling-centric solution.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		<p>8. Values are gradually beginning to understand the value of dwelling centric solutions, but frankly they are not able to assess the pros and cons of CHP etc. Countryside has heard, anecdotally, that values have reacted in a negative manner (when many innovative technologies are being employed) as the RICS Valuation Standards do not cover such matters in the appropriate level in indeed depth. Therefore with professional indemnities at risk, a conservative attitude is applied to valuations, which may cause problems on demand and accordingly supply.</p> <p>9. The requirement heat from British Sugar is not unfortunately waste heat, because it is the wrong temperature for site wide infrastructure. SO new heat of the right temperature will need to be generated, is this sustainable?</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		10. British Sugar providing heat can have a positive reputational value, i.e. a local neighbour is being a good corporate citizen and providing utility provision, local employment and importantly keeping investment and expenditure within the Town. Perversely, this might be seen as a negative given people expect their utilities from a nationally recognised provider. Also, are all people signed up to British Sugar as a positive brand? Furthermore, does British Sugar have a business model to support this secondary area of investment, arguably moving away from its core interests?	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties		11. There is a large emphasis on bio-fuel within the Report, is this truly viable given the tensions of food crop vs. transport fuel vs. housing utility needs? Food and transport are far more valuable markets. What are the impact of commodity prices on such ventures, and accordingly might this infrastructure create a negative legacy rather than its intended purpose?	See above	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Where are the DHNO areas? Why were they not shown on a map?	The areas are set out in a supporting document titled 'Bury Energy Study' which is available to view on the council's website	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The aims of policy BV19 are laudable and the county council is supportive of them. We feel that this policy could be improved if the word 'consider' should be taken out of point 2, in order to both strengthen the policy and improve the wording of the sentence (i.e. if a development site is to prove that district heating is not feasible then they will have already considered it).	This policy has been significantly amended and point 2 is deleted.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments). This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications.		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Sounds great but unachievable & again council cannot be trusted.	There is no information provided to substantiate this claim	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Excellent, need as many varieties of heat/power sources as possible.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Obviously higher environmental standards in building are desirable but the jury is out on the effectiveness of wind farms and is the technology available or is what is suggested part of the green agenda. Great in theory doubtful in practice.	This policy relates to potential district heating networks, not windfarms.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	The use of waste energy through a district heating initiative is welcomed alongside other locally available energy sources. Consideration should also be given to other renewable energy sources such as wind power and ground source heating systems.	This support is welcomed. The other suggested energy sources are addressed in the Development Management Document.	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 25: District Heating Network Opportunity Areas (BV19)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 25a Do you agree with the content of policy BV19?	Question 25b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	The Society supports the section on sustainable energy. However, we consider that there should be a more holistic view of sustainability - including criteria such as carbon consumption, water consumption, transport infrastructure, health and well-being and specification of building materials. The document should also call for specific standards - at least Code 4 as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. By integrating quantifiable carbon targets within a wider reaching sustainable strategy, responsibility will be shared between the local authority and developers.	The majority of these elements are considered elsewhere in the document and are included within the Development Management Document, particularly Policies DM7 and DM8	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	This document should not be seeking to commit the CIL to any specific charging element of expenditure. It could lead to a conflict between documents at such time as CIL charging comes into force.	The policy does not commit the CIL to any specific charging element, but provides an opportunity for appropriate CIL funding.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We do not object to the use of CIL in principle in supporting town-wide sustainability measures but the application of CIL in this field requires further detail in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scope of the charge. Will the basis for the charge the scheme - be a town-wide initiative that warrants use of CIL or is it instead more a neighbourhood specific benefit that would be more appropriate to traditional s.106 contribution pooling? 2. The benefit of the charge. Will the CIL charge provide value for money on a £/CO2 reduction basis in comparison with alternative sustainability measures? 	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>3. The impact on other sustainability measures. Will payment of the charge offset other sustainability requirements i.e. will it be an extra cost or cost neutral to the developer?</p> <p>4. The affordability of the charge. Generally, will the CIL be affordable in terms of other planning contributions sought? How will the viability case be proven?</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While in principle we support the underlying thinking behind the aspirations for sustainability and climate change, we note that the issues addressed, and policies defined in this section are inextricably linked with policies related to Sustainable Growth, Development and Design Principles in Section 3 of the Development Management Policies Preferred Options Document. Having not dissimilar policies in the two documents is thoroughly confusing and we urge the Borough to integrate the material in the two plans into a single clear document.	The support is welcomed. The Local Plan consists of a number of documents which complement and support each other.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion	Developers make massive profits from their projects so any funding required for relief roads, Community green spaces, etc should come from the developer, not the tax payer	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	(District heating) Very expensive to install. It has not worked in London.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no	See attached PDF	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031

Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	This CIL must be used to provide maximum benefit to the people of Bury St Edmunds and surrounding settlements and not to a few, through Policy BV15. The levy MUST be used to assist/alleviate the infrastructure build. The negative to CIL is that it is a retrospective payment and other resources will be required to compile with Core Strategy requirements prior to development.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	Energy infrastructure does not fall within the definition of infrastructure within section 216 of the Planning Act 2008. Given the above we strongly recommend that Allowable Solutions contributions are invested in existing dwellings and non-domestic buildings. As the baseline evidence clearly demonstrates this is where the greatest need and opportunities exist.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler				What does the policy mean? Who provides/supports the levy?	The Levy is paid by developers in relation to new development. Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	This needs to be fully costed so it does not affect the Council Tax payer. Such schemes can seem sensible only to find that it is uneconomic in the long term.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does, in principle, support the use of money raised through the CIL to support the development of district heating schemes as part of a general carbon reduction strategy. We would, however, like to take this opportunity to state that we have a number of important infrastructure requirements relating to our statutory duties (schools, transport etc) that will need to be considered alongside the use of CIL funds to develop district heating schemes.	The support for CIL is recognised. Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	We already pay enough taxes without funding measures to deal with so called green issues	CIL charging transfers the burden for providing infrastructure from the tax payer to the developer. It is a common sense approach to capture surplus heat which would otherwise be lost.	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Another TAX!!!!	CIL charging transfers the burden for providing infrastructure from the tax payer to the developer	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R. Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	More research and case studies needed.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes			No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	This is a good idea to be considered alongside other priorities for the use of this money i.e. west Bury relief road	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes	Should be high to fund road infrastructural improvements / construction	Although this policy relates specifically to the use of CIL district heating and CO2 reduction priorities, it will also be a means of funding for other infrastructure requirements.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 26: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (BV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV20?	Question 26b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	Use CIL for more people benefits than just CO2 reduction. Infrastructure helps those living and visiting the area, maintains vibrancy, makes for safer place	Although this policy relates specifically to the use of CIL district heating and CO2 reduction priorities, it will also be a means of funding for other infrastructure requirements.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	Water shortage will be the biggest problem and planning should start now to accommodate this across all planning areas.	The Council agrees that water (and energy) efficiency are of vital importance. This issue needs to be tackled in both new, and existing, buildings.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion	Hard to see that there is anything on page 53 that is relevant to this question, other than the photo of rubbish being removed.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	The Society supports the section on sustainable energy. However, we consider that there should be a more holistic view of sustainability - including criteria such as carbon consumption, water consumption, transport infrastructure, health and well-being and specification of building materials. The document should also call for specific standards - at least Code 4 as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. By integrating quantifiable carbon targets within a wider reaching sustainable strategy, responsibility will be shared between the local authority and developers.	The Council agrees that there are clear links between the Sustainability and Climate Change theme, and other themes throughout this document (this is highlighted in paragraph 8.8). The specific targets requested have been incorporated within the draft Development Management Policies document (Policies DM7 and DM8).	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	For the reasons set out we do not find any justification for the establishment of CO2 reduction targets significantly higher than Government proposals. We believe that the proposals contained in this plan will at least add significantly to the cost and affordability of new homes and to the ability to deliver financial contributions to community infrastructure including affordable homes and more likely will lead to development being unviable with significant consequential impacts on meeting housing needs, economic growth and stability including the preservation of local jobs.	The justification is provided in the evidence base.	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Not sufficiently far reaching.	Noted	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>Question 27 - Aspiration 2</p> <p>Water resources are a significant issue for Bury St Edmunds as it is located in water stressed region. Whilst the Anglian Water Services water resource plans (and our assessment of regional water availability) have identified that existing resources can facilitate additional growth, this is subject to new development incorporating appropriate water efficiency measures.</p> <p>Therefore we recommend that section 8.6 of Aspiration 2 includes water efficiency measures. Any new development within the borough we would suggest that the highest standards of water efficiency (i.e. dwellings, levels 5 or 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes). Please refer to our additional comments that we made during the focus groups.</p>	Whereas there is merit in including water efficiency measures, levels 5 and 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes relate to far more than just water efficiency measures and cannot be justified by the evidence base.	A new action on water efficiency has been inserted.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood			Generally we support the thrust of the aspirations and proposed actions but this does not cover appropriate development on the edge of settlements where they are sustainable or on previously developed brownfield sites.	These issues are addressed in the Homes and Communities theme of the document.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the aspirations generally but submit that the actions would benefit from further detail in terms of clarification of what the Council considers is embodied in the 'lifetime impact' of development, its assessment, mitigation and its relative weight. Is this in terms of a conventional Environmental Impact Assessment?</p> <p>We would also submit that practical feasibility and viability should be an overarching consideration in the application of sustainability initiatives and targets such as district heating, on-site low carbon energy generation and CO2 reduction.</p> <p>Please also refer to our comments on District Heating, on-site low carbon energy generation and CIL as per Questions 24, 25 and 26 above.</p>	Action 10c in relation to lifetime impact has been amended with additional supporting text included. Feasibility and viability are issues for consideration at the proposals stage.	Action 10c in relation to lifetime impact has been amended with additional supporting text included.
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While in principle we support the underlying thinking behind the aspirations for sustainability and climate change, we note that the issues addressed, and policies defined in this section are inextricably linked with policies related to Sustainable Growth, Development and Design Principles in Section 3 of the Development Management Policies Preferred Options Document. Having not dissimilar policies in the two documents is thoroughly confusing and we urge the Borough to integrate the material in the two plans into a single clear document.	The policies in the draft Development Management Policies document complement the Vision 2031 document and form part of the implementation strategy for the Vision document.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no opinion	This is not clearly stated.	No explanation is provided to support this statement	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		Provision of low carbon emission buildings for accommodation for the elderly and for Care accommodation can be reasonably designed and incorporated within such developments as Care Villages to benefit both the philosophy and the residents by lower charges for their accommodation.	Noted	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no	The key actions the authority should be taking is to deliver significant major renewable capacity across the District rather than relying on the provision through new development.	The Council's aspiration is to incorporate high environmental standards in new and existing buildings	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	What aspirations? Nothing mentioned on page 53 only the question.	Noted	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Yes, but the question of grants, either from government or council is critical in the success of this aspect of the policy.	Thank you for your support. Grants are not within the remit of this document but should they be made available then the aspiration would support their implementation.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes the aspirations as set out in this document, though we believe that there needs to be greater clarity on how these aspirations are delivered. The documents mention setting sustainable construction standards above current minimum standards, with policy 6 of the draft Development Management policies stating that opportunities for delivering higher standards will be identified for specific sites within AAPs or concept statements. However, we cannot find any reference to consideration of higher than required standards at specific locations within the site allocation or draft concept statement elements of these documents. We assume that these considerations will be outlined at later stages, as the proposals move closer to full applications, and we would be pleased to offer our support in ensuring the highest reasonable levels of environmental sustainability at strategic growth locations. We would further suggest that these aspirations could be improved by quantifying what carbon reduction targets it is that St Edmundsbury is seeking to exceed.	The policies in the draft Development Management Policies document complement the Vision 2031 document and form part of the implementation strategy for the Vision document. Policies DM6 and DM7 of the development Management document have been substantially amended following separate consultation to address the specific issues raised.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Adding in targets would give the Vision greater impact. Appropriate targets are difficult to quantify, but the county council would be pleased to assist in doing identifying them. We would suggest that Sustainable Drainage should be mentioned somewhere in connection with climate change, given the increased potential for extreme weather events created by climate change and the increasing importance that this consideration will have in the decision making process in future. We consider that the policies contained in the St Edmundsbury Local Development Framework, together with national requirements on flooding and development, will be sufficient to ensure that flood risk and drainage is managed appropriately in Bury St Edmunds. The Flood and Water Management Act gives Suffolk County Council lead responsibility for flooding in the county and the power to impose requirements on development to manage flood risk, not only from river flooding but surface and groundwater water flooding in the localised areas. As the lead Flood Authority we will continue to work with the borough council and f		
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	We query whether it would be better to incorporate these matters within the Development Management Policy Document?	The policies in the draft Development Management Policies document complement the Vision 2031 document and form part of the implementation strategy for the Vision document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	<p>Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Yes, but many of the actions proposed are compromised or fall short in view of two major issues:</p> <p>Over-Development. The biggest contribution to climate change is the proposed over-expansion of the Town. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extremely harmful effects of building 5,900 houses and increasing the population from 37,000 to 50,000 [Page 58, item 11.3 of Vision].</p> <p>Water Supply, Drought and Energy Costs . Vision assumes that water supplies will be sufficient not only for the current population of the Town but for a further 13,000 inhabitants. Anglian Water's statement to the Council [Page 56, item 10.5 of Vision] that there is sufficient capacity in its supply to accommodate growth to 2031 has a number of caveats concerning demand and supply development schemes.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Whilst the population continues to grow, people will continue to require new dwellings. It is the aim of this aspiration to encourage the required new dwelling to take into account measures to reduce the potential impacts of climate change towards the lowest feasible level. Anglian water is expected to development water supply to meet the demands of the local population over the plan period in the most appropriate manner.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			The collaborative study report on drought issued in March 2012 by Anglia Ruskin University, Standard and Poor's Credit Rating Agency and Trucost Environmental makes grim reading. [www.trucost.com, go to news and events/climate change and water scarcity] The report concluded that due to climate change, East Anglia would suffer severe water shortages and drought over the next 20 years, which would also increase energy costs. Under these circumstances it would surely be most unwise to add to problems by building a further 5,900 houses? Little or no development should go ahead until the water supply can be guaranteed and other infrastructure and service requirements necessary to support such development are in place, or at least guaranteed to be provided when demanded.	Development and water supply should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised.	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	BUT thought should be given to provision of water supply to the area, given the recent and probably future shortage problems.	Development and water supply should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	BSE Vision 2031 is an ambition to expand our town. More homes = more people = more consumption, more waste, more pollution, more CO2 emissions and more damage to our environment. This directly conflicts with any ambition to be sustainable or to effectively tackle climate change.	Thank you for your comments. Housing is proposed to be increased in accordance with anticipated population increases. It is the intention of this aspiration to ensure that the new development to meet housing demand is built to a suitably sustainable level to minimise the potential impact on the climate.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Global warming is a myth and this policy is not necessary, affordable or effective	Thank you for your comment. The aspiration is based on evidence.	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Unachievable just another way to TAX	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no		Noted	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21558E	Peter Turner					Noted	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	I'm concerned about the lack of any solutions or indeed any comment on the demand for water.	Thank you for your comment. An additional action has been added that addresses water efficiency.	A new action on water efficiency has been inserted.
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	Yes, but should also include the need for all new buildings to include design features which reduce the need for heating in the building, thus reducing energy costs for the occupier and improving the living environment. The quality of build should be carefully monitored to ensure the building meets the design intentions and occupiers should be advised on how to heat and ventilate the building effectively in order to maximise savings. This could impact positively on levels of fuel poverty.	The Council considers that these issues are addressed by the aspirations and action	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 27: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 27b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	You are going to make a water shortage in this area into a water crisis. Look at 105 of your own document! The 3 - 4 bedroom houses that will be built will have at least 2 loos in them, 1 bath and 1 shower, plus washing machine, dishwasher etc. I bet my cotton socks each house won't have grey rainwater harvesting facilities as a given for each unit.	Disagree. Water demand is more influenced by the number of people living in a household rather than the number of lavatories in a house. Water demand grew steadily from the 1960s through to 1990, but has stabilised over the last 20 years in response to better leakage control, household metering and a decline in water use by industry. Since 1989 the number of properties in the Anglian region has increased by 20%. Looking forward, the Anglian Water Services Water Resource Management Plan proposes a twin track solution including the leakage control and promotion of water efficiency combined with resource development schemes to increase supply where required.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	The content of some of these is quite technical and do not feel sufficiently qualified to comment.	Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	I think the commitment could be stronger and more detailed	The aspirations and actions and policies in this section have been amended and strengthened	The aspirations and actions and policies in this section have been amended and strengthened

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	Again the actions seem to promise a lot, but there are too many wishes and hopes as opposed to real measurable actions	Detail on how the actions will be measured is set out in the delivery plan.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes. I think the underlying theme of this section - that the community needs to take more responsibility for its own safety - is a radical one. My only concern is whether the actions proposed are sufficient to effect this radical change in culture.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes	Get the police out on the streets not in the office filling in paperwork	This is outside of the council's control	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes	Increase police visibility and involvement with Communities.	The Council recognises the importance of community involvement.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes	Increase police visibility and involvement with Communities.	The Council recognises the importance of community involvement.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	Need to plan and provide alternative locations for channelling 'nuisance' activity such as 'boy racers', graffiti artists, skate boarders etc. See q 34.	The Council agrees that it is important to engage young people in terms of the provision of services and facilities. This is addressed in paragraph 9.5c	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	Try to avoid too many Police in vehicles. Cycles & walking - yes.	Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	The aspirations seem fine. We are pleased to live in a relatively low crime area. Aspiration 2, 9.7, c, should read 'work with partners and the community to dispel myths (for example, that all young people cause a problem, and that all old people are grumpy)'.	Action 13a has been amended to address this issue	Action 13a has been amended.
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We agree with the proposed actions but draw attention to the need to add an action relating to late evening anti-social behaviour which gives rise to much community concern and a perception that at this time the town centre is not always a safe place to be.	The night time economy is referenced in action 12e	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	More police walking or on cycles.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	Increase police visibility and involvement with Communities. Deal with graffiti and vandalism swiftly. Many road sign have been graffitied and simply left giving the town an `inner city` slum reputation. Such issues need to be resolved to stamp out anti social behaviour.	Aspiration 12, action c, highlights the need to engage schools and communities to address issues such as vandalism and littering	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Warm words that come within budget	No explanation given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	It would be good to have police back-up and not a 'do it yourself' attitude from them.	Noted. Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves				One of the challenges to emerge out of Haverhill's fast growth without concurrent support infrastructure and employment availability was the town's well charted social issues. Bury St. Edmunds and its environs are extremely fortunate to be comparatively both safe and low crime - and strenuous efforts are required if this is to be maintained.	Thank you for your comment. Aspiration 12 is considered to support this.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Much required of the community - what are the police actually doing or proposing to do?	Thank you for your comment. The police are encouraging a 'grass root' solution to help reduce crime from the outset rather than dealing with it after an incident has occurred by supporting increased social responsibility.	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Yes, though the use of local groups involvement is admirable the visibility of police is extremely important	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	Involving communities is sensible but must not become the major feature of crime prevention. It should only be to support the Police and not as a cheap alternative.	Various local groups and increased social responsibility within communities is intended to support the police, not replace them.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We are pleased to see that our comments on community safety from earlier focus group sessions have been taken on board in this version of the document, and we welcome the focus on community involvement in the actions section. We would argue that a welcome improvement to this section of the document might be to include reference to the contribution that the borough council can make, given its policy levers, to fire safety. The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service does not anticipate the need for development to contribute to increased capacity at fire stations in Bury St Edmunds, though the county council would remind the borough council of the need for development to provide fire hydrants as per Topic Paper 5 of the Section 106 Developers Guide. Discussions are also underway between the fire service and the countywide Development Management Officers Group regarding the need to consider development in flood zones and the implications for fire and rescue services' role in evacuation.	Thank you for your comments. Amendments have been made to the document.	No changes required
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Most relevant is the provision of sprinklers in new development. Sprinklers do more than just save lives. Sprinklers support businesses and jobs by increasing their resilience to fire (reduced damage means that businesses can be up and running quicker after fires). They also contain fires using less water than would be needed from fire engines and quicker containment means less environmental damage. Whilst we recognise the difficulty of requiring sprinklers in all new development, it is the aim of the county council and it would be a worthy aim for St Edmundsbury, to be articulated in this document; either in the Crime and Safety chapter, or in the Health and Wellbeing chapter. Another useful link might be to the education and skills chapter, to encourage sprinklers in schools. This aspiration/action would (ideally) support a policy in the emerging development management policies.	This has been inserted in action 13c	Action 13 c has been included to cover the installation of sprinkler systems.
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Noted	None

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes with the qualifications given below in b). Yes, but by making the Town a sub-regional centre and increasing the population by 13,000, it is almost certain that the crime rates will escalate and different types of crime may occur that are more associated with larger towns. This is implied on page 17, Item 2.18. of Vision. This is another important reason why the 5,900 houses that are proposed to be built, should be moderated.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	More police are needed everywhere at all times. "Reported" crime may be down but only because people don't bother to report it.	Thank you for your comment. Following consultation it is considered that increasing social responsibility within communities is a more effective option for crime prevention.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes	You need to get young people to understand older people, not the other way around!	The Vision 2031 document seeks to achieve this	Action 13a has been amended.
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			no	More police on the beat just outside town centre	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Simple...more visible policing it isn't that complicated!	Thank you for your comment. This option has been considered but a more effective solution to crime prevention is considered to be increasing social responsibility rather than increasing police surveillance.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Police visibility is crucial but the community must take responsibility for bad behaviour and support the police.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	Police numbers should be increased and there needs to be more involvement with the community. There is a need to act on late evening anti social behaviour which can give the impression that an area (particularly the Town Centre) is not a safe place to be.	Thank you for your comments. Action 12e is considered to address this.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 28: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 28b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	No because actions like 10.12 g does not stipulate how far geographically this will extend	The Council hopes that the broadband network will be expanded across the borough.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Again, the aspirations are excellent, and I especially applaud the aspiration to ensure that infrastructure is visually unobtrusive. My only concern is whether you will actually be able to achieve your aspiration of ensuring that the provision of infrastructure is sufficient to meet all the development that is planned. I am afraid that my experience of the work of the utilities is discouraging. And the current hosepipe ban makes me fear that we do not have the water supply infrastructure to cope with all the extra development you are planning.	Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	We do not want any more development to the East of the town and certainly not as a way of funding infrastructure and services	The principle of developing to the east of the town has been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes	Yes, but they are either limited or doubtful. For example, point 10.5 is already rendered dubious, given that there is a hosepipe ban liable to last into 2013. Water is a finely balanced issue already, and will only be made worse by large increases in population. Debatable in Point 10.7 that the Tayfen Road gasholder is a major hazard. Similar gas holders have been a feature of towns and cities across the world for many decades, without causing major incidents.	See comments in respect of question 27 relating to water supply. The reference to the gasholder in Tayfen is a statement of fact: it is a registered major hazard, as are all such gasholders whether they have been responsible for incidents or not. Such a designation, however, limits the potential for development within close proximity.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes	Point 10.12 (h) is dubious, since the development proposed for in SE Bury is in an area that floods in any winter of normal rainfall. Point 10.12 (l) is wishful thinking. The idea that one local council will be able to influence manufactures to reduce packaging is unrealistic. Large supermarket chains are the only likely source of the muscle to bring about such changes.	The areas liable to flood in SW Bury are known and mapped. It is acknowledged that supermarkets have considerable influence on packaging, but significant progress has already been made from consumers and councils in influencing supermarket behaviour.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>The Document and statements from the Council accept that there are significant problems in the area to the East of the town and further development to the East of the town should not be undertaken until current infrastructure and services issues are resolved.</p> <p>Water and sewage issues have not been given sufficient consideration for this area as is identifiable from the document.</p>	An area of growth to the east of the town was allocated in the Core Strategy in 2010. Further information on infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	<p>The Society recognises that congestion and parking are major issues for many townspeople. We fully support the more efficient use of public transport and much less dependence on the car with improved pedestrian links into the town.</p> <p>However we also recommend that park and ride facilities are allocated at the new housing sites at Westley and Rushbrooke Lane.</p> <p>We suggest that the document should include an approximate timetable for the new infrastructure showing how it will dovetail with new housing starts.</p>	Recent evidence has shown that the town cannot currently support a park and ride site. Further information on infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	The Document and statements from the Council accept that there are significant problems in the area to the East of the town and further development to the East of the town should not be undertaken until current infrastructure and services issues are resolved. Water and sewage issues have not been given sufficient consideration for this area as is identifiable from the document.	An area of growth to the east of the town was allocated in the Core Strategy in 2010. Further information on infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes	Whilst we broadly support the aspirations expressed in Chapter 10, we note the suggestion of providing alternative sewage treatment works to the east of the town. Either this is a serious proposition in which case the Plan should be making provision for such a facility by identifying its location and reserving land accordingly in order to provide the appropriate degree of transparency not only for land directly affected but in relation to other planned land uses or it needs to make clear that there is no potential for this to be delivered within the plan period.	This suggestion is made in response to the known difficulties in the transfer of sewage to the existing water treatment works at Fornham to the north east of Bury St Edmunds. It should, however be seen as an alternative to action (d) rather than an addition.	Combine actions 10.12 (d) and (e)
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	Always talk no action / experimentation with traffic. Action before building commences even if it does not work at least you tried...!! To date NOTHING	This cannot be achieved as it is the development which will fund the improvements.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	Aspiration about broadband provision is not ambitious enough. Infrastructure improvement must be planned strategically for the whole area, not just new developments. Remember Moore's Law (see question 2) and universal cable network.	The town's broadband is already being upgraded. The aspiration seeks to ensure that any new development benefits from a similar level of service.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Not convinced that water supplies and pressures are adequate.	Development and water supply should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			<p>Question 29 - Aspiration 1</p> <p>Having reviewed the Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council Water Cycle Study (WCS), we are in agreement with section 10.6 that Fornham Waste water Treatment Works (WwTW) can cope with proposed growth under its existing discharge consent until 2020. However it has been identified that the existing sewage network has limited capacity, therefore we recommend Anglian Water Services (AWS) be contacted regarding this issue.</p>	The comments in relation to action e are noted and this has been removed	10.12 e has been removed

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			We agree with sections 10.12 C & D to upgrade the town centre sewage system. However we are not in agreement with section 10.12 E, which recommends the provision of an alternative sewage treatment works to the east of the town. Sewage Treatment Works are located so that they can discharge treated effluent into a suitable watercourse. No such watercourse exists in this area.	See above	10.12 e has been removed

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			As a result, any such development would have implications on the ability of the Borough to adhere to the principles of the European Water Framework Directive (WFD), particularly ensuring that new development does not result in the deterioration of water quality. We would therefore recommend that this proposal be deleted and the sewage improvements in line with 10.12 C & D be taken forward as the most suitable option.	See above	see above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	We agree with the aspirations but we would propose that hard numbers are developed that reflect the requirements for a growing town. And, should these not be achieved, then this would act as a brake on housing starts. We have expressed this point elsewhere in the document. In respect of the broadband needs we would seek some indication on whether Westley features in the town's roll-out plan, and when?	Development and infrastructure should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the aspirations to plan improvements in infrastructure and utility services to mitigate growth. We note the proposal to update the IDP and we would be happy to contribute to this in terms of our own research and analysis. The discussion on utilities matches our understanding in terms of:</p> <p>1. Planned growth will be accommodated in terms of planned improvements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Potable water; o Gas; and o Telecoms networks. <p>2. Reinforcement will be required to the existing electricity primary sub-stations.</p>	The advice relating to the WwTW was provided by Anglian Water Services, although it is acknowledged that the sewage network has limitations it will be necessary liaise with AWS in respect of proposals for development.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>5. The existing Sewerage Treatment Works is able to accommodate growth.</p> <p>However, in terms of foul transmission and whilst there may be a constraint in the town centre, direct connection to the existing STW should not be discounted for sites to the east of the town.</p> <p>In terms of the location of new utilities, we submit that the minimisation of visual impact should be with reference to site practicality, financial viability and planning benefits overall.</p>	The CIL project is currently underway and shall be set in accordance with Government guidelines.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree in principle to the use of CIL in funding new infrastructure and utility services but submit that the policy and the application of CIL should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include transport infrastructure but limit the Regulation 123 Schedule to genuinely town-wide infrastructure and allowing some infrastructure to be delivered directly by developers if appropriate with the cost of this direct work being reflected in their overall viability appraisal. 2. Be applied flexibly to exceptional schemes such as the strategic sites which should be dealt with on a bespoke basis. 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	We submit that the use of CIL for transport improvements should not be excluded but equally the funding of infrastructure improvements should be flexible and pragmatic in terms of direct works by a developer and/or the pooling of contributions either through s.106 or CIL.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	The crucial importance of adequate infrastructure and service provision, and the need to ensure that by good planning there are no shortfalls, is of real concern to the Branch and for this reason the aspirations and proposed actions of the Borough are strongly supported. There is a good case for developer contributions where new development leads to the need to reinforce or improve particular services. Care needs to be taken that charges in the Community Infrastructure Levy are pitched at a level which adequately funds any shortfalls in services created by proposed developments.	The CIL project is currently underway and shall be set in accordance with Government guidelines.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Water pressure at times already on the low side - how will it cope?	Aspirations seek to address widescale infrastructure issues. Water pressure is one aspect which is sought to be improved.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15946	Michael Brabrook			no	<p>Bury St Edmunds is a medieval town it has narrow streets. It is bisected by a railway. A143 access to Bury from the north east is via single track roads controlled by traffic lights, under or over railway bridges built in 1850 for horses and carts. The Council has not published any credible transport strategy for the new main roads, new railway bridges, A14 access points that will be required for the additional traffic generated by the increased housing, or how will they be paid for? Rather it thinks tinkering with traffic lights, getting everyone to go by public transport or cycling is going to solve the problem which it certainly will not.</p>	<p>Development and infrastructure should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised. Infrastructure improvements are to be funded by new development and provided as part of any permission.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Michael Brabrook				<p>Building 1200 houses by the A143 with 2 additional access roundabouts will mean that it will be impossible for traffic from Great Barton, Ixworth, Stanton, Diss and beyond to access Bury. There is no scope for large scale development without improving the roads and that can't be done without destroying Bury. Already we have gridlock for hours at a time. Building another 6000 houses is going to destroy the character of Bury and a unique market town. It cannot take any additional traffic. Developing out from Bury will mean that the existing villages of Westley, Fornham All Saints and Great Barton will be overtaken by the development to become suburbs and housing estates of Bury and viable independent village communities will be lost forever.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>The Document and statements from the Council accept that there are significant problems in the area to the East of the town and further development to the East of the town should not be undertaken until current infrastructure and services issues are resolved.</p> <p>Like most large towns, Bury would benefit from a ring road, circling the town from the Eastern side A14 to the western boundary A14 interchange</p>	<p>Development and infrastructure should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised. Infrastructure improvements are to be funded by new development and provided as part of any permission.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	This will lead to higher rates and bureaucracy	Thank you for your comment. The benefits of supporting the provision of efficient infrastructure is considered to outweigh the costs.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton				Skinner Street should be on a daily sack collection. Eastgate Weir should be removed and both the Lark and the Linnet should have water flowing in them all year round	The issue of Skinner Street will be addressed as part of the rebuilding on Cupola House. The Eastgate weir maintains a body of water in the Abbey Gardens during dry periods.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	<p>No The aspirations are not all embracing of the necessary infrastructure for Bury St Edmunds and the impact on the immediate village communities.</p> <p>The road infrastructure in and around Bury and its interface with the A14 is not adequately covered elsewhere in this consultation document, viz Qu 23. Therefore for this document to state this is considered separately must imply this is addressed in another document! This aspect requires consultation in the next round for this Vision to be fully effective and serve this local community.</p>	The aspirations and actions are just one part of the Vision for the town. Development and infrastructure should be addressed hand in hand. Infrastructure improvements are to be funded by new development and provided as part of any permission. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies this document and sets out how the infrastructure can be delivered.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Para10.12 i says design development to accommodate flooding and make efficient use of land. What does this mean other than continuation of urban cramming without any real proposals to deal with water issues be they too little or too much?	Paragraph 1i has been deleted as these issues are covered elsewhere in the document	Paragraph 1i has been deleted
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		1. <input type="checkbox"/> The local road structures and infrastructure re hospital and schools need to be addressed before any of these forward plans take place. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> The town is bursting at the seams already and part of any development should include a working Park and Ride because where are future car parks going to be put near to the town centre?	Development and infrastructure should be addressed hand in hand. It is not feasible to create an excess supply until demand is to be realised. Infrastructure improvements are to be funded by new development and provided as part of any permission.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15988	Mark Ereira-Guyer			yes	Anglian Water cannot supply current homes when weather is dry so won't be able to supply more. Sort existing drainage/maintain/clean drains along roads!	The advice provided by Anglian Water can be relied upon. Although a private company, they are a regulated statutory undertaker. There is no advantage to the company in allowing development which would exceed the capacity of their treatment works.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery				<p>In both the Vision documents, the majority of new employment opportunities are established to the south side of Bury's 'railway east-west divide'. The major commuter crossing points are already constrained by single alternative working and are completely inadequate and unsustainable taken against a proposed increase in the size of the town by over 30% in just 20 years.</p> <p>Areas that are already routinely gridlocked will become wholly impassable, particularly at peak times. In addition, greater attention should focus on micro businesses in the rural areas, including those which operate from home, with a key priority being the improvement of digital infrastructure and high speed internet.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Rural areas are addressed in Rural Vision 2031. Transport issues are addressed in section 7 of this document. Aspiration 14 supports the provision of high speed broadband.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves				I have to say that the thinking and subsequent development of infrastructure is far too slow in relation to industrial and retail manufacturing. In the same way that the Pearl Harbour attack ensured that the Allies would win the war through the awakening of American industrial muscle it was inevitable that the growth of car ownership would expand rapidly through volume production over the last 20 years yet this has largely been ignored by planners.	Disagree. The post war era has seen massive road construction in parts of the country to accommodate growth of car usage. However, this has merely facilitated more car travel to the detriment of the environment and not reduced congestion. Proposals for significant road building in Bury St Edmunds, including the Tayfen Link Road were abandoned in the 1990s for this very reason.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15993	John Dean			yes	We agree with the aim of the infrastructure being visually unobtrusive. However, there is a need to be conscious of the costs which may be involved - for example, undergrounding power lines can be expensive and sterilise land around the undergrounding.	Thank you for your comments. Section 10 has been amended to reflect this issue.	Aspiration 2 has been omitted.
BVR16000	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	What is grey water? More water meters needed?	Noted	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Yes	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council		yes	<p>The county council does not oppose the aspirations in this chapter, though we would suggest that Aspiration 1 could be more proactive. The NPPF makes it clear that 'significant weight' should be placed on the need to support economic growth, and that LPAs should plan positively for infrastructure investment. On that basis, Aspiration 1 might be improved through rewording it to say that infrastructure provision should facilitate and encourage the growth of the town, rather than simply responding to growth. We support the action to ensure that new development is connected to high speed broadband, though we would ask what action St Edmundsbury is willing or able to take in support of this action through planning policy. We would be pleased to work with you on ways of achieving this action.</p>	<p>The action has been amended to include the word facilitate. The council welcomes the support proposed to meet this aspiration.</p>	Action 14 amended
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012							30

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council		yes	We note the plan to update your Infrastructure Delivery Plan outlined in 10.2 and look forward to supporting you in this process, if required. 10.3 might be improved with a fuller description of the infrastructure that is and isn't included in this section. For example, we note that education facilities, which we would term as infrastructure, are not included in this chapter and so this paragraph might reflect this as it does with transport infrastructure. We would also suggest that this chapter does not discount Section 106 as a means of delivering infrastructure. Section 106 is not being eliminated, even if St Edmundsbury does become a CIL charging authority, and it is likely to continue to play an important part in funding necessary infrastructure in the future. Lastly, this chapter might make reference to the fact that guidance on developer contributions exists, via the Section 106	Although education is part of the infrastructure of the town, it is a significant element in its own right and therefore, has a dedicated chapter in this document. A reference has been made in para 10.3 to reflect this. Section 106 and CIL charging will have a significant role to play in delivering the necessary infrastructure. A reference to S106 included in para 10.1.	Paragraph 10.3 has been updated to include education. Reference to S106 in para 10.1.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16020	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	Frontier Key Fund	yes	We agree with those parts of this chapter as commented on above and relevant to the Tayfen Road site.	Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)			Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Yes, but many of the actions proposed are compromised or fall short in view of two major issues: Over-Development. The biggest contribution to climate change is the proposed 34% expansion of the Town. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extreme harmful of effects of building 5,900 houses and increasing the population from 37,000 to 50,000 [Page 58, item 11.3 of Vision].	The advice provided by Anglian Water can be relied upon. Although a private company, they are a regulated statutory undertaker. There is no advantage to the company in allowing development which would exceed the capacity of their treatment works.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents.</p>			<p>Water Supply, Drought and Energy Costs . Vision assumes that water supplies will be sufficient not only for the current population of the Town but for a further 13,000 inhabitants. Anglian water's reported statement [Page 56, Item 10.5] that there is sufficient capacity in its supply to accommodate growth to 2031 has a number of caveats about concerning demand and supply development schemes. The collaborative study report on drought issued in March 2012 by Anglia Ruskin university, Standard and Poor's Credit Rating Agency and Trucost Environmental makes grim reading. [www.trucost.com, go to news and events/climate change and water scarcity] The report concluded that due to climate e change,</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			East Anglia would suffer severe water shortages and drought over the next 20 years, which would also increase energy costs. Under these circumstances it would surely be most unwise to add to the problem by building a further 5,900 houses? Little or no development should go ahead until the water supply can be guaranteed and other infrastructure and service requirements necessary to support such development are in place, or at least guaranteed to be provided when demanded.	See above	No changes required
BVR16032	Charlie Bradford			yes	See h) - don't develop the Lark Valley area as shown on BV6!	The Lark Valley corridor will be protected and improvements made to public access under policy BV21 and BV28	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16034	Sylvia Bartlett			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Unachievable & guess who will end up paying for this????	Development will fund the improvements.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Infrastructure before development.	This cannot be achieved as it is the development which will fund the improvements.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Yes. Essential for future development and maintain the towns infrastructure	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	There is already problems with infrastructure and water shortage. This must be properly addressed before any growth is approved.	This cannot be achieved as it is the development which will fund the improvements. See comments in response to Question 27 relating to water usage.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		yes	The overhead power lines at Natterer's Wood, Mount Road, are intrusive and constrain the design of the woodland. Woodland Ways would like to see the burial and/or diversion of the cables as a priority aspiration.	Aspiration 2 has been omitted. Section 10 has been amended to take into account this issue.	New action 14a to cover this point.
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	I'd stress need to ensure changes in infrastructure levy are of a level to adequately fund infrastructure required both now and as a result of the proposed developments.	Infrastructure Levy funding (CIL) may only be used to provide infrastructure arising from the development proposed. It cannot be used to address existing infrastructure deficiencies.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough				ROADS NEED TO BE SORTED TO EVEN GET THE OTHER SERVICES MOVING EFFICIENTLY	Thank you for your comment. This issue is addressed by section 7.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			yes	Yes however by building on Ram Meadow you are building in a flood zone and increasing the risk of flooding.	The flood risks are known and will require appropriate mitigation.	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The Document and statements from the Council accept that there are significant problems in the area to the East of the town and further development to the East of the town should not be undertaken until current infrastructure and services issues are resolved. Water and sewage issues have not been given sufficient consideration.	Major infrastructure improvements cannot be completed before all development takes place as it is the development which will fund the improvements. Water issues are addressed in response to question 27. Sewage issues are addressed by action 14 (d)	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	The Documents accept that there are significant problems in the area to the East of the town. No further development to the East of the town should be undertaken until the problems with the roads and parking have been dealt with. Water and sewage problems have not been given sufficient consideration for the East of the Town.	Major infrastructure improvements cannot be completed before all development takes place as it is the development which will fund the improvements. Water issues are addressed in response to question 27. Sewage issues are addressed by action 14 (d)	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	Please see my comments regarding water usage overleaf. This very week we have flooding in Fornham Road.	Major infrastructure improvements cannot be completed before all development takes place as it is the development which will fund the improvements. Water issues are addressed in response to question 27. Sewage issues are addressed by action 14 (d)	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion	For some aspects of infrastructure development, a health impact assessment may be necessary/recommended to ensure the mitigation of any adverse effects on human health & enhance any positive impacts.	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 29: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 29b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	We need the A14 junctions improved. The proposed developments will bring gridlock if the road network is not resolved and cause economic decline.	It is acknowledged that improvements to the A14 junctions is fundamental. Transport issues are addressed in section 7.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	We would object to extensive landscaping and/or the construction of a hotel at this location on historic landscape grounds. Any development in this area - especially in the northern half - will have a deleterious effect on the setting of the cathedral and historic settlement core approached and viewed from the south-east of the town.	no		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15790	Mrs P M Lamb	Rougham Parish Council		no	<p>As previously advised, since most of the land to be developed for the Moreton Hall and Business Park extensions fall within this Parish, there needs to be ongoing consultation with this Council during all stages of the developments.</p> <p>Members are unanimous in their opposition to any attempted transfer of these developments into Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>Since the Rushbrooke Lane development will impact on this Parish, we again expect to be fully consulted at every stage.</p>			<p>Consultation will be ongoing. Although within the parish of Rougham, the site represents an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds and would only serve to cause confusion if repeated in the rural Vision 2031 document.</p> <p>The uses existing at Rougham airfield are acknowledged and have been taken fully into account.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs P M Lamb	Rougham Parish Council			<p>It is strongly recommended that, since both the above proposals will impact on a number of rural parishes, they should also be incorporated within the Rural Vision 2031 documentation and processes.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to the whole of St Edmundsbury, and beyond, that Rougham Airfield continues to be used as a recreational area, which includes the use of aircraft and air displays. Therefore any development of the area next to the airfield has to take into consideration the flight-paths currently operated.</p>			See above	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	The Leg of Mutton should remain a natural area without any buildings or development. Do not desecrate the open vista to town with unnecessary building We do not need another hotel here.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Object in the strongest terms to the proposed development of the Leg of Mutton. This field has been refused planning permission on previous occasions going back to the late 1970s on the basis that it was of high importance to the historical setting of Bury St Edmunds, and nothing has happened since then to change it. Those decisions were correct in the past and should be upheld. The existing footpath between the River Lark and the Leg of Mutton is a very pleasant walkway, in regular use by many local people and valued for its rural quality. Furthermore, the use of the Leg of Mutton for agriculture is a strong cultural link with Bury's past as an agricultural market town, and 'Disneyfication' of the field would break that link.	no opinion		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				<p>There is already talk of turning part of the old Shire Hall into a hotel, which seems a very appropriate plan and it seems highly unlikely that yet another hotel would be viable on the Leg of Mutton site.</p> <p>The impact on the wildlife interest of the adjacent No Man's Meadows of the additional human disturbance is likely to be considerable and would greatly decrease its amenity value as a quiet and pleasant retreat close to the town centre.</p>			See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>The Leg of Mutton should remain a natural area without any buildings or development.</p> <p>Do not desecrate the open vista to town with unnecessary buildings. This was identified as a significant element by the SE Bury developers in their proposals.</p>	yes		<p>This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation</p>	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	Society supports sensitive use of 'Leg of Mutton' land off Rougham Road for recreational use. However we would not support allocation of land for a hotel. We consider that sufficient sites have already been identified within the town.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	The Leg of Mutton should remain a natural area without any buildings or development. Do not desecrate the open vista to town with unnecessary buildings. This was identified as a significant element by the SE Bury developers in their proposals.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Type of developments need to be specified. Eg anything involving buildings may not be appropriate.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Retain nature area.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15935	Richard Russell				<p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Specifically relating to 'Policy BV21 - Land to the west of Rougham Hill' . I think that it would be very desirable if built into the middle of this strip there a sizeable fenced-off community nature conservation zone which local residents could get involved in, and which could be used as a learning tool for conservation issues. There is a good example of this at Needham Market on the north side of the river. It needs to be far enough away from the public thoroughfares at either end, and thereby be somewhat protected from the unwanted attentions of revellers returning home.</p> <p>I think also that priority should be given to trying to make at least one of the main vehicle access routes into the town from the A14 rather more attractive than at present, and this Rougham Hill approach probably offers the best opportunity, though it's a pity that the Police Investigation unit was allowed to happen.</p>			<p>This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation</p>	<p>Policy BV21 amended</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Russell				But some strategic landscaping along this route would help, whereas an indoor leisure/fitness centre almost certainly wouldn't, as it is likely to be just another big tin shed surrounded by car parking. And surely any concerns about quality would suggest that this would be a miserable site for half-decent hotel?.			See above	See above
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Natural area should be retained.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	Another possible for site of new proposed Health Campus.			The site for the new hospital was agreed in the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2010.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No further explanation is provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	Thank you for responding
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	Thank you for responding
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	The support is welcomed
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	This area, whilst potentially as viable as others for development, should not be entered into without careful consultation regarding the impact of traffic management	yes		These issues will be considered during the production of a development brief for the site	The support is welcomed

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes	For leisure as in the Airfield only i.e. no housing			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			no	The Leg of Mutton should remain a green open space. No hotel or any other building should be allowed.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	This should not have any buildings and left for its natural beauty but strategically arranged as a protected area from development.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Para 11.5 A hotel and indoor leisure and fitness facility are not 'limited associated buildings.' Leave the land as open space.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock				2. The planners should view the prospect looking east from Nowton Road and look across the Victory Ground to Rougham Hill and see that the visual amenity will be completely destroyed with houses right up to the A14. (Who wants to live near the noisy A 14!)			This proposal is for leisure and recreation use and not for houses.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	Too close to an already heavily congested road area. Prone to problems/queues/accidents.	no opinion		Traffic issues will be considered as part of the development brief	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust			Whilst we recognise that the allocation of this, currently agricultural, site is primarily for recreational use we note that policy BV21 also includes provisions for built facilities associated with this use. This site is adjacent to the River Lark and has the potential to form a valuable green space within the river corridor, therefore any built development should be carefully sited and designed so as to ensure that it has no adverse impact on the natural environment, including lighting and recreational pressure.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We would potentially object to extensive landscaping and/or the construction of a hotel at this location on historic landscape grounds. Any development in this area - especially in the northern half - will have a deleterious effect on the setting of the cathedral and historic settlement core approached and viewed from the south-east of the town and Policy BV27 must be rigorously (but proportionately) applied to ensure that the setting of Bury St Edmunds town centre is preserved. There is PROW providing an important link from the Moreton Hall area towards the town centre. Any development or changes to this site should not compromise this link. To improve clarity, it would be helpful to re-orientate the map on this page, or at least provide an indication of which direction is North.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		no	The Society is very supportive of the use of this space for informal recreation. The Society wishes to strongly object to the erection of a hotel or other leisure related buildings given the sensitivity of this site an important element in the landscape setting of this historic town. In the opinion of the Society, this area should be protected in perpetuity as a key greenspace for future generations to enjoy. Hotel and leisure related development would also serve to harm the primacy and economic viability of the town centre.			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments) This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications.		no	As it says on page 58, Item 11.5 of Vision, the land is an important open area and should therefore not be developed in any way - and that includes the hotel and indoor leisure centre suggested.	no opinion		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	BUT protect the Lark Valley corridor and footpath - Old Vinefields Way - the width should be greater than shown.	no	See above.	The support is welcomed. The Lark Valley corridor is a project under GI Policy BV28	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	This is valuable cropland and should remain so. It should not be developed for leisure, hotels or recreation - too far from centre to be easily accessed by foot.	no	This is far too broad a site to be considered for development, especially as it is adjacent to the River Lark and is an important landscape separating Bury town from Moreton Hall.	This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21342E	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae		Smiths Gore						No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			no	<p>Outdoor recreational use' must be clarified.</p> <p>This area is a precious 'green lung' and must remain an open protected space only allowing informal recreation eg walking, wildlife and nature trails.</p> <p>Ideally keep it as it is providing the natural setting and important identity of our historic town. Increase woodland planting which would reduce noise from A14 and benefit the environment.</p> <p>Enhance the site by removing the overhead telephone wires and the ugly pylons.</p>			This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	this area should remain as it is	no opinion		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	cancel it.	no	Too near the Abbey and A14	This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no				No further explanation is provided to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	This should remain a natural area without any buildings or development. Do not ruin the open vista to town with unnecessary buildings. This was identified as a significant element by the SE Bury developers in their proposals.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The Leg of Mutton should stay a natural area without any buildings or development. The open view to town should not be spoilt by buildings.	yes		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	A qualified yes. I think that this is currently relatively low-grade arable land / open space and therefore leisure use is appropriate. The reference to a new "hotel" seems an inappropriate use of this land and would like to see this removed. Any leisure development would need to be in the context of the overall development in this area and the possible negative effect on traffic movements / volumes.	no opinion		This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	No buildings and a covenant placed on the area to remain unspoilt	yes	Left as it and protected	This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation. The council is unable to place a covenant on land owned by a third party	Policy BV21 amended
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15980	Simon Butler-Finbow	Pigeon			<p>Pigeon has been appointed as the landowner's development partner for the promotion of this site. The company's approach is to work with landowners, local authorities and local people to gain support for its development proposals. It always adopts a 'partnership approach' to its projects, believing that stakeholder involvement is preferable to any other approach. As such Pigeon look forward to working with St Edmundsbury in realising the full potential of this site.</p> <p>The Council's aspiration to provide a wide range of top quality cultural and leisure facilities is to be supported, particularly as the town's population is set to grow from 37,000 to approximately 50,000 over the next two decades.</p>			<p>This forms an important open area and will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy BV28. The policy has been amended to strengthen the requirement for buildings and landscaping to be kept to a minimum and for any development on the site to be located adjoining Rougham Hill. A development brief is required which will be subject to further public consultation</p>	<p>Policy BV21 amended</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Butler-Finbow	Pigeon			<p>It is clearly desirable to increase the amount of leisure provision to match the increasing population.</p> <p>Land to the west of Rougham Hill has the potential to cater for informal and formal outdoor recreation along with an opportunity to provide leisure/fitness facilities such as a hotel, sports centre and sports clubs' accommodation. It is considered that these uses can be provided without compromising views of the town centre (i.e. in accordance with draft policy BV27). As such the allocation of the 15ha site is to be supported.</p>			See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Butler-Finbow	Pigeon			The Vision document looks to identify, in due course, the amount of land and its distribution of uses by the preparation of a detailed Development Brief. To this end a Land Use Plan is attached which seeks to inform this process. It proposes a range of leisure uses which would seek to meet the needs of Bury St Edmunds without unduly compromising views of the town.			See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 30: Land West of Rougham Hill (BV21)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with Policy BV21?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 30c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 30d -If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Butler-Finbow	Pigeon			<p>In supporting BV21 it is requested that the Borough Council in turn offer support for the Land Use Plan attached to this representation.</p> <p>It is hoped that the above clearly outlines the position regarding this matter but if further assistance is required please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>			See above	see above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15776	Jess Tipper					no	This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	It is not intended that this site be the subject of any significant development and a development brief is unlikely to be required. However, any applications for any individual buildings will need to be the subject of archaeological evaluation.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	The area should be maintained as an open space with minimum development.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	The area should be maintained as an open area for use as a show ground and display area with minimum development.	yes		At present, the airfield has no formal planning recognition or protection. This policy is intended to recognise the existing use of the site and protect it for the future.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Rougham Tower Association should be consulted properly.			Rougham Tower Association has been consulted properly	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		no opinion		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	The area should be maintained as an open area for use as a show ground and display area with no development permitted.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes	For leisure as in the Airfield only i.e. no housing			This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Once any new build is permitted on Rougham Airfield, the door will be open for more unwanted, unjustified expansion not associated with this site of national and international importance.			The policy seeks to recognise and protect the existing use of the site. The site would remain countryside and any new buildings would be strictly controlled and related to the existing use.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation before a Development Brief is prepared to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). This site has some potential for use as a park and ride site, so ongoing discussions with transport policy officers at the county council on Bury St Edmunds ought to include whether or not this site has the potential to aid transport improvements for the town.			It is not intended that this site be the subject of any significant development and a development brief is unlikely to be required. However, any applications for any individual buildings will need to be the subject of archaeological evaluation. Any proposals for a park and ride facility will need to have regard to the principal use of the site established by this policy.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with the qualifications in b) below. Any building should be severely limited and any planning application be subject to approval by local residents.	no opinion		This support is welcomed. Any applications for any form of development will be subject to consultation with local people.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		no opinion	Not shown	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Leave the airfield alone	no opinion		At present, the airfield has no formal planning recognition or protection. This policy is intended to recognise the existing use of the site and protect it for the future.	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes	Existing historical buildings & structures must be maintained	no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		no	I would like to see what remains of it left alone!			At present, the airfield has no formal planning recognition or protection. This policy is intended to recognise the existing use of the site and protect it for the future.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes				This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		no opinion		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 31: Rougham Airfield (BV22)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV22	Question 31b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Question 31c - Is the site boundary correct?	Question 31d - If not, please tell us how it should be changed?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion				Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	I thought allotments were the responsibility of the Town Council? Clearly more will be needed to allow residents to counter rising food prices in future.	The Vision 2031 document is not about WHO provides the service but the needs of the town and how they are provided.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Policy is too conservative. Should aim to increase allotments rather than control decrease. New developments should be designed to incorporate areas for new allotments.	This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>I would welcome the inclusion of some allotment areas within new development and some provision (currently lacking) for the Moreton Hall area of town. Land for development should be set aside for this purpose.</p> <p>In addition, land set aside for future development (eg. land for a new future school) should be pressed into service for this purpose on short term basis. This would generate short term income whilst providing for the local community</p>	This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			no	Remove the word 'unless' and a) and b) which follows, and the sentence starting 'Any replacement'. Bury St Edmunds Town Council owns and manages five allotment sites. There is a waiting list of 80+ names, many of whom have been seeking a plot for two years or more. I suspect there is a latent demand, especially on Moreton Hall with its postage stamp size gardens not big enough to grow more than two dandelions let alone any vegetables. The town council leases 38x5 rod plots from SEBC at Cotton Lane at £23 per plot per year. Wouldn't it be great if each of the five Strategic Growth Areas provided allotment gardens on a ratio of 1:20 new builds? Moreton Hall for example would have for example 25x5 rod plots available for rental from the town council.	The proposed changes would in effect propose an absolute ban on the loss of all allotments regardless of circumstances and would be fundamentally unsound. This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	Land for allotments should be expanded not merely explored if used for other purposes. With the expansion of numbers of residents, land for allotments need also to expand.	This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council supports these safeguards for allotments, which encourage healthy eating and exercise, with numerous associated health and wellbeing benefits, as well as reducing food miles.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that allotments are a resource of immense significance to the well being of local residents and should be protected from loss to alternative uses unless such loss can be mitigated effectively.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Stronger protection for existing allotments because their soil structure is special and takes years of intensive input to create. More determination to create new allotments to encourage local food production. Protect gardens (private allotments) from development.	This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Allotments are an anachronism and I see nothing wrong with building over them where necessary	The current demand for allotments outstrips supply and those which are most accessible to residents are often those which are at greatest threat of loss to alternative development.	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	Need more all over the town	This policy is intended to protect those allotments which currently exist. New allotment provision will be encouraged in new developments through the masterplan/development brief process.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 32: Allotments (BV23)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV23?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	I think that exception b) is a get out of jail free card for developers.	Exception b) is essential to ensure that any allotments lost can be provided for elsewhere.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21732E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row		yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 33: Public Art**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 33a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes, as far as they go, but this section seems to focus on sports and outdoor recreation and I don't think there is enough emphasis upon arts, entertainment and heritage	The Council considers that arts and heritage are important and contribute to the culture and heritage of the area.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society very warmly supports these policies in respect of allotments and public art. Could document call for space to be allocated for new allotments on the identified out of town development sites.	Sites for the provision of additional allotments will be identified in the Masterplans and Development Briefs.	No changes required
BVR15806	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust			Your main theatre is mentioned in para.2.21 and, as stated in para.11.17, theatres always need improvements to keep pace with public expectations and the needs of performers and producers. We support the aspirations at para.11.19 to maximise the use of existing culture and leisure facilities, and to work with the voluntary sector to enhance opportunities. Although local authorities are under no obligation to provide leisure services (para.11.17) they have a responsibility to future generations to ensure that they have access to theatres. Theatre use should be valued because a thriving theatre sector is a mark of a culturally enriched society and there is a growing awareness of the role that the arts and culture play in developing an educated workforce and, on the other hand, in attracting an educated workforce to a town. The infrastructure that is provided for communities - quality of life will become an increasingly important element in attracting new residents.	The Council considers that arts and heritage are important and contribute to the culture and heritage of the area.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion	Added on Q.33 Sorry. Roads before arts. So Sorry	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes	No. Proposed actions must include music, drama and art specifically and plans must address their needs. Also this is an opportunity to address the needs of racers, graffiti artists, skateboarders (your photo!) etc see q 28	Thank you for your comments. Crime and safety is addressed in section 9.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes	On public art, added: not a priority - infrastructure first On culture and leisure, added: suggest private finance	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We support the culture and leisure aspirations and proposed actions. However, we believe a good deal could be done to promote these activities by creating a centralised promotional and booking system. The Tourist Information Centre is ideally placed to perform this role so that tickets for virtually all events could be obtained easily from a single website or by visiting the TIC. This would also help to promote the attraction of the town to potential visitors since it could, and should, be linked with tourist information.	This is an issue for consideration by leisure services.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Other things should come before additional expenditure on art.	Thank you for your comments. Section 11 covers a range of aspects of culture and leisure along with public art.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes	(Q 33 above) Because we feel we should look after what we have and bring out of storage items which have disappeared costumes, clocks, paintings.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Council control on the quality, quantity and location of new play areas and equipment at the planning stage has been poor, resulting in unwanted or inappropriate play equipment. Informal play areas, particularly where they won't adversely affect residential amenity should be a priority. In future, make proper provision by resisting the urge to build on every parcel of open space.	The introduction of the supplementary planning document on open space contributions will assist with the provision of open space and equipment across the borough.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	(Q 33) But do not put any more weird and obstructive 'art' on roundabouts/traffic junctions (as per Risbygate/Tayfen/Parkway Roundabout)	Public art can be very subjective and one person's artistic gem may be another person's 'weird and obstructive art'.	No changes required
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves				These factors also influence the support and success of the areas' entertainment, leisure and cultural life. It is our view that Bury St. Edmunds is quite well served by a range of venues (even if the Theatre Royal is unbearably uncomfortable). Other facilities, including sport and fitness, are also high standard. For the future however, inadequate provision of parking and evening transport, certainly with increased population could have a negative impact.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	(Q 33 above ticked no). Money could be better spent elsewhere. Please no more 'legal' graffiti (eg underpass Ortewell Rd).	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Would appear that an increase in Council workforce will be needed to achieve these aspirations.	The aspirations and actions can only be achieved through collaborative partnership working	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			33. Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town? The county council has no comment on this issue at this time, other than to say that the provision of public art installations should not compromise access for pedestrians, cyclists or the mobility impaired. We note that there is no mention of county council culture and leisure services, such as libraries, in this document. It may be improved by making reference to the county councils' approach to seeking developer contributions for leisure and cultural provision, as set out in the Section 106 Developers Guide. Libraries are a statutory, inclusive service that works in partnership and cooperation across the leisure, educational and wellbeing sectors. They are likely to increase their role as hubs for community activity and as access points for leisure and cultural activity. The county council vision for libraries is that they will be managed and run by paid staff, as now, with community governance groups ensuring a focus on local needs and aspirations.	The Council welcomes the support from the County Council and considers libraries to be an important part of our culture and heritage. Reference to libraries has been strengthened in aspiration 15 b of this document	Reference made to libraries in action 15b

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			This should be reflected in this document. The Access Model for Suffolk's libraries, based on the Local Development Framework adopted by district and borough councils, identifies a continuing need for a library in major centres and towns like Bury St Edmunds. They are expected to share premises with other services where this is possible, and will be open at times to suit their community. There is a good fit with other leisure, cultural and educational providers. The building will be increasingly available as a community resource, both as a space for organisations and individuals to meet, and as a forum for promoting leisure and learning activity. Larger libraries like Bury St Edmunds will support outreach activity to surrounding neighbourhoods, including cultural and educational events and services.	See above	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	Leisure and cultural facilities should be provided by the public sector and paid for by the people who use them not funded from by the ratepayer	The financial cost of these facilities is recognised in the leisure and culture section.	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no opinion	Doubt whether it would be affordable again cannot trust council or developers	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			no	re. 11.5 The Leg of Mutton Field provides the natural historic setting and identity of the town. To allow any development under the guise of 'fitness and leisure', or 'cultural and leisure aspirations' including an hotel is completely unacceptable. This would open up a dangerous precedent for future development. Please keep this a protected area enhanced by planting a tree belt nr the A14 to reduce the traffic noise. further woodland planting and removal of overhead telephone wires would greatly enhance the area of natural open space. It is an essential and precious part of the town's green infrastructure and heritage.	Policy BV21 has been amended strengthen the protection against any inappropriate development.	Policy BV21 has been amended
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	BSE Leisure Services are varied and of good quality and need to be maintained.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	It must be cost effective and the Council should not in these straightened times be subsidising any leisure or other cultural facility unless with very good reason that benefits the community as a whole.	Thank you for your comment. This point is addressed by amendments under aspiration 16	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion	Allotments are an essentially selfish land-use, where a very small proportion of the population get a great benefit at highly subsidised cost, with everyone else excluded. It would be better to use this land for public open space such as community woodland open to everyone.	Allotments are an important resource for the local community which the council supports. Sites for new allotments, where appropriate, will be set out in Masterplans and development briefs	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 34: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 34b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21732E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row		yes	The proposal is very dependant on school's help in achieving these goals and a risk is that they do not see this as a priority.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes	yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Quentin Cornish			no	See answers to questions above. To plan for WSH to expand or even remain in steady state would be foolish. There will be no need to relocate it - a health "campus" will be another managers' vanity project unconnected with changing need or patterns of provision. WSH is on a perfectly good site already which will be adequate when they down-size in future.	The policy would not prejudice the downsizing of the hospital should that occur. However, it would be foolish not to cater for expanding needs of the hospital, serving West Suffolk.	No changes required
Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Diane Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Chris Lale			no	c) (reduce dependency on cars) is not sufficient. Transport links, including road infrastructure, must be improved too. West Suffolk is a rural area and road transport is often the only option. Current road links are already inadequate.	It is acknowledged that travel by car is the only option for some. However, there are those who could take advantage of alternative modes of transport if they were available. The need for c) does not just depend upon road links.	No changes required
John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	While we strongly support the policy our concerns revolve around the issues selected for inclusion in the text - efficient land use, car parking, and a travel plan. We are concerned to note that as drafted the policy only requires the hospital to prepare a master plan if there are any 'major development proposals'. This is not the correct approach. We are aware that the hospital has already prepared a master plan but that it has not been agreed with the Borough. Indeed the current Borough Replacement Local Plan 2016 (Policy DS4) requires the hospital to prepare one but it has failed to do so. The whole point of such a plan is to enable the planning authority to assess what is proposed for development against what has been deemed acceptable in the master plan.	The West Suffolk Hospital has already announced its intention to vacate the current site towards the end of the plan period. Accordingly a master plan is no longer deemed necessary. However, should circumstances change and major development is proposed the requirement for a master plan will return.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			If the plan is not prepared and adopted first there is a real danger that the preparation of a plan at the same time as a development is proposed will lead to it being used to justify what is proposed rather than to test whether what is proposed is acceptable. [We draw attention to the fact that this is what has been required of the West Suffolk College - see policy BV25 - why not the Hospital where the best use of a very cramped site needs careful consideration?]	See above	No changes required
Joan Dean			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Michael Brabrook			no	MP David Ruffley stated that there was no chance of a new hospital being developed at Westley as stated in the plan and that the West Suffolk Hospital will be around for a long time at its present location. The access to the hospital is along a congested road, either via the congested traffic lights at Out Westgate or via the congested Southgate Green roundabout. Building more houses in the vicinity as envisaged is going to exacerbate the situation further to the point where emergency vehicle access to the hospital will be impossible. This will force the NHS to withdraw the A&E facilities from the hospital and everyone will be forced to travel to Ipswich or Cambridge to get to their nearest A&E. Is this progress no, rather regression.	The stated objective of the Foundation trust is to relocate the hospital to a new site with easy access from the A14 to serve the needs of West Suffolk and it is this information we have to use to plan for future requirements. However, the policy does take account of an alternative scenario by requiring a masterplan approach to any major development.	No changes required
David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Unfortunately cars will be needed.	This is acknowledged. A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative.	No changes required
Mr J B Brennan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mrs I M Brennan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
David Nettleton			yes	Mostly agree but - a travel plan should eliminate 90% of car parking provision and provide safe, secure bicycle storage and workplace showers for staff. The existing bike shed is falling down and cannot accommodate the increasing demand even now. A cordon sanitaire of at least 500 metres should be placed around the site to prevent anyone parking unless they hold a permit from the council. The CLB will pass the front entrance to WSH in both directions.	These are issues which can be addressed in a travel plan.	No changes required
Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Jilly Jackson			yes	I do not understand why there is need for new hospital site at Westley if WSH plans to develop on the existing site. This question is 'tucked away' in a similar fashion to the one some years ago, when SEBC originally asked if we thought there was need for a new hospital. I think in the consultation document of 2008 or 2009	The stated objective of the Foundation trust is to relocate the hospital to a new site with easy access from the A14 to serve the needs of West Suffolk and it is this information we have to use to plan for future requirements. This policy has regard to alternative options should they arise. Rather than being 'tucked away' this is the first question under the chapter entitled 'Health and Wellbeing'.	No changes required
Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	How can you allow extension and not have an impact on surrounding area? (Hardwick Heath). How do you propose reducing use of private cars to get to hospital?	This is the fundamental reason for this policy, to address these issues. There are dangers which need to be quantified relative to any development proposed and adequate mitigation put in place.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	How will community groups and individuals take more responsibility in health services. Levels of responsibility and skills extremely important.	Agree that community involvement is important. These issues are considered in the health and well being section	No changes required
S J Greig			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			At this time there are reported concerns about the level of on-street parking in the roads around the hospital. It is reported that the level of parking relates to the current parking provision, charging rates and policy on overstaying due to unpredicted extended treatment times. Any expansion within the hospital site would require evidence that there would be no further detrimental impact on the highway. The travel plans would need to be revisited and updated to ensure that the impact of the development on staff, patient and visitor demand was considered and mitigated. Any travel plan should be monitored to ensure compliance.	Noted and agreed.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society supports the retention of health uses on the existing site even if the provision of such facilities in a campus format is sought at Westley. This is due to the sustainable location of the existing facilities and their accessibility for town centre residents.	It is acknowledged that the existing site is accessible to residents of the town centre, but the hospital serves the needs of the whole of West Suffolk. The future of the present site will need to be assessed should the move to Westley take place towards the end of the plan period.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). We are opposed to the proposed relocation of West Suffolk Hospital to Westley for the reasons given in our response to Question 36.	Far from being located in a village a number of miles from Bury, the proposed new hospital site is located approximately 1.4 miles from the western edge of the town centre (the existing site is approximately 0.6 miles from the southern edge of the town centre), and is accessible from the western and northern sides of the town. However, the hospital serves the needs of the whole of West Suffolk, not just Bury St Edmunds and needs to be located in an accessible location with direct access from the A14.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>				See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Provision of parking fro workers AND visitors MUST be provided either at reasonable rates or free. This should be added to f).	Free parking would not address the problems of congestion or reduce dependency on the car. A balance is needed to meet the requirements of those who have no alternative to the car and those who can use alternatives.	No changes required
John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Jill Burrows			no	Joke???? Not enough parking at hospital NO workable alternative...expensive parking.....cannot trust hospital management council or developers!!!	A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes	BUT sort out car parking & costs, very expensive for more than just an appointment.	This is acknowledged. A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative.	No changes required
David Chapman			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Agree if a workable parking/travel plan is implemented.	This support is welcomed and requirement noted	No changes required
Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	You will need either to ensure adequate car parking or very good bus services.	These requirements are incorporated at b) and c).	No changes required
David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	A proper plan plus sensible and adequate car parking provision. We need to ensure any new hospital is adequate for the needs of an increasing population	A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative. Any new hospital facility will be required to meet the growing needs of West Suffolk.	No changes required
Anne Zarattini			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
Matthew Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	Agree in general, but it seems wasteful to consider large capital expense on new buildings when the decision has been taken to relocate in due course unless necessary for the appropriate treatment of patients at the time.	This observation is acknowledged, but circumstances can change over such a long plan period and the policy needs to be flexible enough to cater for any such changes.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Carol Eagles			no opinion	The Hospital currently does a good job although parking is limited.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Nicola Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
K & A Bishop			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 35: West Suffolk Hospital and St Nicholas' Hospice (BV24)

Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV24?	Question 35b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Tim Harbord	West Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust	Tim Harbord Associates	yes	However, the Trust requests the insertion of wording in the preamble to Policy BV24 advising that should the site be vacated prior to 2031 following the opening of the new hospital the site should be developed for housing and community uses in accordance with Policy BV10. Please see supporting statement.	The request is acknowledged, but until such time as the available area and remaining uses are known, following the relocation of the hospital, it would be premature. It would be appropriate to prepare a separate policy for the site at a later date in a review of this document following full consultation.	No changes required
Mr and Mrs G King			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Eddie Gibson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15774	Dr Giles Stevens				<p>I am a local GP and a resident of Bury St Edmunds with a young family.</p> <p>Having read your Vision 2031 consultation document and specifically section 12, relating to Health and Wellbeing (Policy BV 24, in part) I am keen to help you achieve sufficient provision for the significant demand the planned developments will place on the Primary Care services (GP Surgeries) in and around Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>There are currently 5 GP surgeries in Bury St Edmunds with an average patient population of 11 900. The new 4350 homes to be built in and around the town will probably raise the overall population within the area by another 10-12k. This is equivalent to another entirely new surgery or the population of each current practice being increased by 20%. Simplistically, in order to absorb this each practice would need to be doing close to nothing for a whole day a week at present and from experience this is not the case.</p>	<p>Although the provision of additional healthcare facilities through Section 106/CIL funding is an important part element required to accommodate growth in the town, the Vision document looks beyond meeting such requirements at other elements which can improve the quality of life for residents. This is explained in the introduction to this section of the document.</p> <p>The particular issues raised are, however, equally relevant and we welcome the opportunity to work in partnership with those people who can help inform and deliver those services.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dr Giles Stevens				<p>Add to this that the population will be older than at present and the workload will likely increase significantly in excess of 20%.</p> <p>Without an increase in primary care provision, the current system will not succeed in meeting the future demand. This in turn would impact on the West Suffolk Hospital and its future security as provider for secondary care for our residents.</p> <p>I would like serious consideration to be given to using a Community Infrastructure Levy in order to fund the construction of a new Health Centre.</p> <p>These new facilities could potentially be planned in conjunction with the new West Suffolk Hospital and reflect the future ways this organisation will provide Secondary Care. Furthermore, new premises could also be constructed to take into account the wider, more holistic view of Vision 2031 that being healthy is much more simply not being ill. Further still, the location and nature of the buildings could be targetted directly at those more deprived areas.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dr Giles Stevens				A number of microsurgeries is one possibility, operating from a hub and using IT to facilitate passage of referrals, searching in patients' electronic records and other required admin tasks such as looking up results remotely. These microsurgeries could either be in the middle of deprived areas or in Local Centres built in the new housing. Either would also help Vision 2031 help achieve its aim of reducing road usage where possible. Please can you email me back, explaining your plans for the future provision of Primary Care? I am keen to become involved beyond simply raising concerns, all the way to being considered to run the new service.	Noted	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes, although they do not go far enough. For example, the proposed actions for providing for an ageing population do not do nearly enough to address the issue.	The Council recognises that providing for an ageing population is complex and will require the intervention and support of many sectors.	None
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society broadly supports this policy and aspirations. However we have reservations in respect of a relocation of the hospital. Could consideration be given to its location to the north of the A14 Westley junction to allow for its future expansion?	The location of the hospital has been considered and confirmed by the adopted Core Strategy. It will not be required until towards the end of the plan period, during which time details of the requirements of the hospital can be developed further, taking account of the concerns.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			no	We are totally opposed to the proposed position of the new Hospital and wonder how the car parking will surely affect the village being a large cull de sac and also the noise and pollution from the incinerator chimney.	The location of the hospital has been considered and confirmed by the adopted Core Strategy. It will not be required until towards the end of the plan period, during which time details of the requirements of the hospital can be developed further, taking account of the concerns.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	The aspirations are sound and we have no issue with these. We are more concerned with the decision on the reserved location for a new West Suffolk Hospital (alongside our village). Health Campus The Vision 2031 document makes a very brief reference to a decision having already been made to locate a new Hospital (a Health Campus) to the West of Bury St Edmunds. There has been very little public consultation on this decision, and neither have any of the decision criteria been shared. We understand that a number of sites were assessed, but that the NHS Trust had a preference for the location abutting the Village of Westley. This decision seems to have been taken against the narrowest of criteria –'a nice piece of flat land near the A14' - with little/no consideration for all of the other holistic themes expressed in Vision 2031. We strongly feel that:	The location of the hospital has been considered and confirmed by the adopted Core Strategy. It will not be required until towards the end of the plan period, during which time details of the requirements of the hospital can be developed further, taking account of the concerns.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEBC needs to be much more transparent on the decision making process and the specific criteria for the campus location; SEBC needs to explore locations, which better suit a wider set of aspirations for the town and environs (e.g. transport, employment etc.); And, on this latter point it is important to stress the following strongly held views of Westley Village: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Health Campus has many of the characteristics of an Industrial complex. A significant proportion of the area will be tarmaced for vehicles, and brightly lit on a 24-hour basis. There will be constant access including heliport use. 	See above	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current planned location is in the very close vicinity of housing of just two stories high, which would demand likewise for the new Hospital Campus. This is inefficient in the use of space, particularly given that it will devour greenfield land. With the revolution in Healthcare it seems inappropriate to discount the prospect of constructing higher-rise Hi-Tech buildings that contain those valuable assets in a single secure facility and be much more efficient in space utilisation. We are naturally assuming the height restriction will also restrict the ability for the site to house an incinerator? Off-site incineration will increase associated road-traffic. 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treating a Health Campus as a stand-alone and self-contained facility will not reap the same benefits as if the full ecosystem of healthcare were taken into account. For example, if the Campus was situated at a location where suppliers and partners could co-exist then this would minimise traffic and even act as a stimulation for the growth of businesses around the Campus as a client. To be more specific, siting the Campus at a business park where suppliers and partners such as FM Support; IT Support; Pathology, Forensic and Gene Sequencing Laboratories; Cleaning Services; Laundry Services; Food Preparation and Packaging, might locate could: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce road transport through nearby co-location of those suppliers/partners; • Make parking available for multiple uses, increasing efficiency - much as the Cattle Market parking serves Retail during the day and then the Restaurants and Cinema complex in the evening. • Create a critical mass for a better and more frequent public transport; • Offer better scope for energy efficiency through the potential for shared power infra 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stimulate business for those suppliers who are efficiently serving the current hospital and look to expand e.g. Food preparation, IT support. • Offer more accommodation flexibility in adapting to the changes in Healthcare in the decades to come e.g. Care in the Community, Healthcare structures and partnering. <p>The Westley location has none of the above advantages, and the site in the preferred plan shows the Campus tightly bounded and tucked right up against the Village Settlement boundary. This pays no heed to the aspiration to avoid coalescence. Even if SEBC could justify this stand-alone Campus there are much better locations where the traffic, and associated noise and light pollution will not have such a negative impact.</p> <p>Furthermore, Vision 2031 seems to make no statement on the intentions for the existing (19 Hectares) hospital location. This is a significant piece of land, for which the local community has no memory of this being other than a fully developed site (e.g. it can be considered as brownfield, and hence a priority for housing development).</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				If the intent is to re-locate the hospital then we should all be able to benefit from this existing site taking some of the burden of the housing growth expectations. It is also clear that the future of the Sugar Factory is uncertain. Given this brownfield location is close to the town centre and the 'centre of gravity' of the Bury population, then we would consider that this could be an ideal location for a Hospital Campus that suffers none of the disadvantages of the proposed site, would sit on land targeted for employment and offer opportunities for the Healthcare ecosystem described above, and close to higher density public transport.	See above	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				Recommendation 8: That the decision to locate a new Health Campus to the West of Bury St Edmunds is revisited to provide a clearer justification for the use of a limited Greenfield location, to explain why alternative sites were rejected and to specify the transport infrastructure changes which will allow it to take place. The Parish Council understands that this development is not scheduled to take place until much later in the planning phase and further consultation would support local democracy without undermining the provision of local health facilities.	See above	No changes required
	Chris Anderson				Recommendation 9: To explain the plans for the existing Hardwick Lane Hospital site should the new Campus be built? Since Vision 2031 is making provision within this timescale for a new location then SEBC should reveal the strategy for the existing site of some 19 hectares. This will be a brownfield site, which should be a priority for development before greenfield development.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15936	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood			<p>We would refer you to the answers given above which should be read in conjunction with this Policy Statement.</p> <p>We note in paragraph 16.7 that the Borough have only addressed the question of healthcare provision for residents in their homes. Because of the shortage of resources provision in the homes can only be of a limited extent. The private sector is providing increased specialist accommodation and related housing to address the elderly sector which is due to grow considerably in and beyond the Plan period and where the Borough Council must seek to allocate and plan with the private sector for increased provision in order to safeguard the welfare and amenities of that growing ageing population.</p>	This is recognised in the actions and aspirations in the homes and communities section. Planning applications for specialist care facilities can be dealt with on a case by case basis.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the general approach in terms of:</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The use of community hubs and the dual use of facilities where possible.</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Community transport initiatives to support access to health services and other measures in response to an ageing population.</p> <p>In terms of the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS), we agree with its aspirations towards an improved network of green spaces and public access. We would submit, however, that the GIS needs to be flexible in terms of its detailed application in response to neighbourhood-level community engagement</p>	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We agree with the aspirations and proposed actions for this topic, but there is a need to ensure that where new facilities are provided there are adequate funds available to staff and run them.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	I do not agree with proposed Westley site because of noise and light pollution that will come from this site. It would be better located to Suffolk Business park on pg 24. Rougham airfield could site a helipad, easy access from the A14. Site can provide supportive services.	The location of the hospital has been considered and confirmed by the adopted Core Strategy. It will not be required until towards the end of the plan period, during which time details of the requirements of the hospital can be developed further, taking account of the concerns.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Agree - especially as I live in Eastgate Ward. I will be 68 in June. Only 9.3 years to go! I like the photo of the late Nat Lofthouse on page 64	Thank you for your contribution.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		Our answer to this question and section should be referenced back to the answers given above on the other questions where we have highlighted provision and allocations for the elderly as a prime consideration for the Borough.	This is recognised in the actions and aspirations in the homes and communities section. Planning applications for specialist care facilities can be dealt with on a case by case basis.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock				4.A new hospital will be required as the present one could just not cope with all the extra residents. A & E barely copes now with the present number of casualties. (I know from a recent experience when I had to wait on a trolley in the A & E waiting area for nearly four hours)	Thank you for your comments. The aspirations and actions are considered to support improvements to the provision of health care within the Town.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	You will struggle to get any support from the health authorities in anything but the most acute of cases.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Assuming building will go ahead no matter what BSE residents say, bungalows should be built to accommodate ageing population.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	More solar energy 12.10 'will' instead of 'may'.	Thank you for your comments, however, 'may' is to be retained as not every older person requires help.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	The 'encourage self help and volunteering' should not be a substitute for the Authority to provide adequate care for the aged, unwell or needy.	Thank you for your comments. Self help is one part of a range of incentives to support an ageing population.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We would suggest that Aspiration 2 might be improved with a reference to the importance of countryside access in supporting physical and mental wellbeing. This relates to an outward view of the town, not a town-centric view. It goes beyond simple access to quality green space, which infers managed urban green space, but covers access to general countryside, including farmland, long distance paths and promoted routes. The aspiration could be to 'improve and enhance countryside access for the physical and mental wellbeing of communities'. Aspiration 3 would be improved with an action linked to housing, which would link well to the Homes and Communities aspirations. Housing is an important determinate of health, especially in terms of supporting older people.	Agree that access to the countryside is an important issue for inclusion in the Bury Vision. Action inserted in the historic and natural environment section.	New action 27b in the historic environment section added around access to the countryside.
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			There also ought to be an action around the accessibility of the built environment. If older people are unable (or feel unable) to access retail, health and community facilities then this has significant negative implications for health and wellbeing. It would be worth considering the recent government report; 'Lifetime Neighbourhood'; for an holistic approach to older people, planning and housing development.	The Council considers that walkable neighbourhood and communities are important. This is addressed in the Homes and Communities section of this document.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b).We are broadly in agreement with the aspirations but with one major exception concerning the relocation of West Suffolk Hospital to Wesley on page 62, item 12.4, f of Vision) West Suffolk Hospital We object to the relocation of west Suffolk Hospital to Westley. We believe it is quite unrealistic and inappropriate to place the hospital in a village location a number of miles from Bury. It would no longer be easily accessible for the majority of town residents. We believe the Hospital Foundation, like many other hospitals, should concentrate its efforts on developing the existing site. With innovative thinking and design, the existing spaces can be developed and additional storeys added to many parts of the hospital buildings, particularly those which are only one or two storeys.	Far from being located in a village a number of miles from Bury, the proposed new hospital site is located approximately 1.4 miles from the western edge of the town centre (the existing site is approximately 0.6 miles from the southern edge of the town centre), and is accessible from the western and northern sides of the town. However, the hospital serves the needs of the whole of West Suffolk, not just Bury St Edmunds and needs to be located in an accessible location with direct access from the A14.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			With care in the community coming on stream, day surgery, out-patient care and other health initiatives, there will be shorter periods for in-patients thus reducing the need for increased bed capacity. ng Hardwick Lane, Home Farm Lane and Sharp Road. If the expansion of the town is moderated, this will decrease the pressure for the move. The details of any proposed redevelopment of the hospital site must be agreed with local residents. As a minimum, such consultation must include all residents living in roads surrounding the hospital and Hardwick Heath includi	See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	See above	Noted	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	In the main although in certain areas such as the North West development there should be provision for health centre/GP surgery	A new community hub is identified on the concept plan which will provide the focus for new community facilities which could include healthcare.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 36: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 36b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	Relying on self help and volunteering to support older people is wishful thinking. The council needs to give a lead by thinking more imaginatively about what will be a growing issue for the town	Thank you for your comments. The council shall continue to work in association with health care providers to ensure that the needs of the town are met.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15776	Jess Tipper			no	No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	This requirement is noted and can be attached as a condition to any planning permission.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Policy must include the retention and protection of existing green space.	The policy requires adherence to the existing masterplan. Additional text has been added to retain and protect the wooded area which reflects the masterplan for the site.	Amended policy to make specific reference to the protection of the copse area.
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	Agreed. It is important that the college is able to develop to meet the needs of students of all ages as well as local employers, so that it can continue to be a provider of quality further and higher education for the West Suffolk community. Sustainable development with consideration for the environment will further enhance the college's position and enable it to provide the skills and knowledge needed to support the local economy.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
	Chris Anderson			yes	SEBC should continue to work closely with the college to encourage the take-up of apprenticeships and to tackle the problems related to youth unemployment.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson			yes	<p>Although the college's success rate is currently above the national average it can be further improved. At present there is often insufficient knowledge about the apprenticeship options in schools for young people to make informed decisions, particularly with regard to the growth areas of the local economy and opportunities they offer. Should the local school re-organisation go ahead this will need to be undertaken in such a way to ensure that all of the existing school premises are used effectively. However, it is important that each school has sufficient accommodation and facilities to educate all its children on one site.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>The concept of dual-use of school buildings is supported to make effective use of the facilities that communities have at their heart. A new secondary/ upper school on the east side of town will help to rebalance the current situation where all of the upper schools are on the western side of the town.</p> <p>As a more general point relating to education for 5-18 year olds, we feel it is important to compliment Bury St Edmunds and Suffolk CC on providing an excellent education service. Many people in the village have expressed genuine satisfaction at the quality of education provision in the town.</p>		
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	We agree with Policy BV25 which controls development at the West Suffolk College noting that it already possesses a masterplan. Similarly we agree with Policy BV26 which safeguards schools and educational establishments - although we fail to see how a 'proposed school' can be safeguarded. Does the policy mean sites for proposed schools? It will be important to ensure that, in the light of forthcoming extensive changes in education within the town, there is continued equality of access and opportunity. We concur with the education and skills aspirations.	This support is welcomed. The conclusion reached in respect of proposed schools (Policy BV26) is correct.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			no	Get rid of the car parks on site and like the hospital site, impose a Total Exclusion Zone for 500 metres around the site.	A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative. Total exclusion will not meet this objective.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council would welcome improvements to FE and HE provision in Bury St Edmunds. No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. The travel plan would also need to be monitored to ensure that the proposals were effective. The emphasis should be on the use of sustainable transport options rather than the automatic increase in parking provision. The impact on the immediate surrounding area should also be considered.	The archaeological requirement is noted and can be attached as a condition to any planning permission. The travel plan will require monitoring, including the effects upon the surrounding area.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Not enough parking already for students & its expensive	A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative. Simply providing additional parking at low cost will encourage unnecessary car journeys adding to congestion on the surrounding road network.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Further - A Train Station at Beetons Way would also help relieve congestion and enable students from the surrounding villages to travel in to the college.	This support is welcomed. Given the proximity to the central railway station, an additional train station at Beetons Way is unlikely to be a realistic proposition. However, improved access between the rail station and the College should be incorporated into the redevelopment proposals at Station Hill.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	To meet the needs of the current population, particularly young people and to provide the levels of knowledge and skills needed to attract inward investors it is essential that West Suffolk College is supported in its developments. A key area of development for the future will be the extension in provision of higher education and higher level apprenticeships to meet the skills needs of future jobs. The college should also be supported in the development of new skills needed in relation to carbon reduction technologies.	The comments are noted and this support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 37: West Suffolk college (BV25)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 37a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV25?	Question 37b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	Statements b) and c) seem to be contradictory - reduce dependence on the car but increase parking.	A balance is required to meet the requirements of those with no alternative other than the use of a car and those who could use a viable alternative.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbots Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. As worded, the policy would not prejudice the suggested opportunities for Moreton Hall.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbots Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. As worded, the policy would not prejudice the suggested opportunities for Moreton Hall.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris			yes		This support is	No changes
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			We agree with Policy BV25 which controls development at the West Suffolk College noting that it already possesses a masterplan. Similarly we agree with Policy BV26 which safeguards schools and educational establishments - although we fail to see how a 'proposed school' can be safeguarded. Does the policy mean sites for proposed schools? It will be important to ensure that, in the light of forthcoming extensive changes in education within the town, there is continued equality of access and opportunity. We concur with the education and skills aspirations.	This support is welcomed. Yes, the safeguarding of proposed schools does mean the safeguarding of the sites for schools and thereafter the safeguarding of the school once it is provided.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbotts Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. As worded, the policy would not prejudice the suggested opportunities for Moreton Hall.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Difficult to comment during the current national and local shambles regarding children's education in general and Bury in particular.</p> <p>Reference to surplus school buildings is premature and likely to remain so until funding available to provide larger primary and secondary accommodation.</p> <p>The borough council cannot ensure that future new school development is on the eastern side of town. Policy CS11 does NOT provide for a new secondary school at Moreton Hall; it provides land only, with no guarantee that a school will be provided.</p>	<p>The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome.</p> <p>The borough council does not build schools, but it can ensure that the land is retained for school purposes. The need for an additional upper school has been identified and the site at Moreton Hall is the only site which has been put forward for that provision.</p> <p>Constructive discussions are being had with the education providers through the Vision 2031 process.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Closure of Middle Schools imminent. How would you use those?	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. Should the middle schools close, the requirements of this policy would apply.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes	Actions c) and d) in para. 13.9 appear to be contradictory. The former seeks to protect sites for education/community use whilst the latter states that policies will be relaxed.	Correct. Action d) in 13.9 should be deleted.	Delete action d) in 13.9
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Do not build a school under a flight path. Personally I would have preferred the 3 tier system to be kept. New secondary school on Moreton Hall to be built ASAP.	There is sufficient space that a school can be built at Moreton Hall avoiding the flight path of Rougham Airfield.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no	13.9d Would query removal of policies protecting schools use. Taking sports etc away goes against aspirations set out in question 36.	Correct. Action d) in 13.9 should be deleted.	Delete action d) in 13.9
BVR16006	S J Greig			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has no strategic or service comments to make on this question in this response, but a response to this question may come forward from our Corporate Property department.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Predictions are notoriously inaccurate	This policy relates to safeguarding school establishments and is not reliant upon predictions.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes	make sure playing fields were protected	Playing fields are included in the protection	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbots Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015.	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. As worded, the policy would not prejudice the suggested opportunities for Moreton Hall.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbots Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged and the policy needs to take account of any outcome. As worded, the policy would not prejudice the suggested opportunities for Moreton Hall.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 38: Safeguarding Education establishments (BV26)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV26?	Question 38b - If not, what changes would you like to see and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	Yes albeit they are somewhat vague	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Yes, although again I question whether they are enough to achieve your aspirations, especially the one about education providers raising aspirations and creating the workforce of the future. These aspirations are laudable but I question whether you will be able to achieve the change in culture of schools which would be necessary.	Thank you for your support. Your comments are noted.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes	See comments under question 37	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society generally supports these policies particularly the importance of the West Suffolk College and dual use of school buildings.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>Our consultation feedback has highlighted the importance of education to the local community. This is not only in terms of access to school places but also with respect to the role of schools in neighbourhood character and identity, rush hour traffic congestion as well as access to employment.</p> <p>We note the prospect of the school system moving to a two tier structure and the likelihood that irrespective of planned growth in the town:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing primary schools will need to expand to accommodate the 4-11 age group. 2. Existing middle and/or upper schools will need to expand to accommodate the 11-16 age group. <p>Planned growth will need to be mitigated across the town in terms of early years, primary and secondary places and we note the new primary schools proposed at 3 of the 5 strategic sites and a new Upper/Secondary School proposed at Moreton Hall.</p>	The outcome of the Schools Organisation Review (SOR) cannot be pre-judged. The borough council does not build schools, but it can ensure that the land is retained for school purposes. The need for an additional upper school has been identified with new primary school provision identified on 3 of the large areas of growth. Constructive discussions are being had with the education providers through the Vision 2031 process which will continue to the masterplan and planning application stage. .	No changes required
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>We submit that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Until the School Organisation Review is adopted, planning within the Action Plan needs to cater for both 2 tier and 3 tier systems and the variable implications for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The use of existing schools. b. The requirement for new school sites. c. The location of new community facilities and dual use opportunities. d. Traffic mitigation and travel planning. e. Costs and funding. 2. Given the town-wide benefit of proposed new school places, new provision should be funded through town-wide contributions, most appropriately through CIL which does not restrict the number of pooled contributions. 3. Where strategic sites provides new education places directly, the cost of this should be reimbursed through their CIL levy and reflected in their viability assessment overall. 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			We agree with Policy BV25 which controls development at the West Suffolk College noting that it already possesses a masterplan. Similarly we agree with Policy BV26 which safeguards schools and educational establishments - although we fail to see how a 'proposed school' can be safeguarded. Does the policy mean sites for proposed schools? It will be important to ensure that, in the light of forthcoming extensive changes in education within the town, there is continued equality of access and opportunity. We concur with the education and skills aspirations.	Yes, the safeguarding of proposed schools does mean the safeguarding of the sites for schools and thereafter the safeguarding of the school once it is provided.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	You will need to be wary of using schools for out of hours recreation - extra wear and tear will need to be addressed and Suffolk County Council will not foot the bill to cover St Edmundsbury's residents' use.	Thank you for your support. Your comments are noted.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no	13.9d Would query removal of poicies protecting schools use. Taking sports etc away goes against aspirations set out in question 36.	Agreed	Remove category (d) from paragraph 13.9

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		Thank you for your support	None
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Given the county council's lead on the Suffolk-wide Skills for the Future strategy, we are pleased to see the borough council cover post-16 skills issues in this document. We welcome the reference to apprenticeships, but there is no mention of raising the participation age to 17 from 2013 onwards, and to 18 from 2015. This does not make remaining at school compulsory, but does require individuals to remain in some form of education or training post-16. Perhaps some mention in the vision of the need to create relevant provision to meet this need aligned to the needs of the local economy would be helpful. Action 13.14a) might be improved with a reference to key partners (Chambers of Commerce, Suffolk Education-Business Partnership, etc), as well as local employers, in improving information to pupils. As is set out in the first appendix to this letter, it is very difficult at this time to identify an appropriate distribution of additional school capacity in Bury St Edmunds.	Agree - The Council agrees that the raising of the participation age needs to be addressed. Additional sentence added in para 13.13. We consider it would not be appropriate to refer to individual bodies in action 13.14a as this would exclude other equally important partners.	Amend paragraph 13.13
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council will work with St Edmundsbury and local schools to develop a strategy for school provision in the town, and this document might make reference to the fact that development will be expected to contribute to the school infrastructure requirements arising from that process. The numerous references to dual uses for schools ought to be tested with local schools and school governors, though of course St Edmundsbury cannot be criticised for wishing to see greater use of school facilities. We would suggest that some changes need to be made to the supporting text regarding the Schools Organisation Review. For example, the heading suggests that the review will result in the three tier system being replaced with a two tier system; this is not necessarily the case. Lastly, we feel that the text could do more in terms of reflecting the emergence of Free Schools and Academies. (See attached letter Appendix 1 Education Provision).	The Council considers that the issue of different schools provision is outlined in 13.7. A change has been made to the introductory para to make clarify that SOR won't always result in two tier.	Amendment to introductory para
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	As above	Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	More a national education matter of getting the basics right then training people in the right skills that employers require and anticipating future changes in technology etc.	Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21558E	Peter Turner					Noted	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebally			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes	Fully agree, particularly keen to see schools being used for greater community use. If the two tier system is introduced each school should have sufficient accommodation on one site for all its students rather than being spread across sites.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	The current SOR appears likely to result in multi-site two tier schools and this can and should be avoided on Moreton Hall by ensuring that Abbots Green is expanded to include years 5 & 6 in 2013, Sebert Wood should be encouraged in its plans to expand at the earliest opportunity, and the Secondary School should be ready to start taking year 7 students in 2015.	The suggested provision will need to be made to accord with the timetable for SOR.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 39: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with our aspirations for education and skills?	Question 39b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	The Policy seems to bear little relationship to most of the content of Section 14. For example, most of the putative 'semi-natural green space' along the River Lark (see map on page 71) coincides with the area proposed to be covered by urban sprawl. The whole of Section 14 seems to be an unfocused mish-mash and certainly Question 40 covers only a very small aspect of the content of Section 14.	The policy relates to one specific element of Chapter 14 relating to the Historic Core of Bury St Edmunds and requires specific control of development. It is acknowledged that the remainder of the chapter covers a wide range of issues which are addressed by positive actions rather than control of development.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Protecting vista along Abbeygate Street only is far too narrow. The whole eastern green belt should be included.	The policy is wider than the one view along Abbeygate street and includes all views into and out of the historic core.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	<p>As stated the Consultation is flawed .</p> <p>The Council fails to have regard to the historic medieval plan around which Bury St Edmunds is based and centred.</p> <p>Hitherto the Council has failed to have regard to European Conventions on the Built Environment and Landscapes. There is a danger that this will be repeated.</p> <p>This policy in its present form does not show a strong enough commitment to protection of heritage</p> <p>Concern is that the approach has been shaped by the Historic Towns Forum rather than a proper assessment.</p>	<p>Disagree. The consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the respective and appropriate Planning legislation and, accordingly, any wider legislative framework.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector examining the final draft will need to be assured that this has happened. The built and natural environment within conservation areas is strictly protected and is reinforced by the imposition of Article 4 Directions which take away permitted development rights in relation to what development requires planning consent.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Alan Murdie			no		This demonstrates a strong commitment to protection of the heritage. The approach to Bury St Edmunds is that which is considered appropriate to the town and has had close regard to good practice published by a number of heritage organisations including English Heritage.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	However the infrastructure needs to be sorted out first	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Noted	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	As outlined in LDF Policy 1(C).	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust			<p>Paragraph 14.7 (h): This action relates to the provision of a new country park to the north of the town. We recommend that more detail is included within the document to help ensure that its implementation will be achieved.</p> <p>Paragraphs 14.12 to 14.14: We support the references to the importance of green infrastructure and the St Edmundsbury Green Infrastructure Strategy (2009) contained within these paragraphs. However, whilst as drafted the Vision 2031 includes reference to a number of green infrastructure projects, we query through what mechanisms these projects will be implemented? We consider that in order for this document to be sufficiently robust further detail relating to the implementation of the green infrastructure strategy should be included, as currently worded the document appears to be little more than a reiteration of the aspirations of the green infrastructure strategy.</p>	A new policy on green infrastructure has been inserted. The delivery of these projects will be monitored through this document and the infrastructure delivery plan. Specific projects will be delivered through the implementation of the strategic growth areas.	New policy on green infrastructure inserted

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council welcomes attempts to preserve the townscape value of historic Bury St Edmunds, though we have no specific comments to make on this policy at this time, though we would like to mention that consideration should be given to the pallet of materials used for any improvements or enhancements to ensure an appropriate level of maintenance liability.	A Streetscape Strategy has been prepared and adopted for Bury St Edmunds town centre in partnership with the highways authority. It contains an agreed palette of materials which any improvements and enhancement works will be expected to adhere to,.	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>				This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Joke!! Council has already ruined the historic core & town centre!!!	Disagree. The historic core has stood the test of time by adapting the use of buildings and spaces to meet the demands of modern day needs.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes	BUT not ins the same style as the ARC which will soon look shabby.	Noted	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Agree but planners have already contravened the policy by allowing the inappropriate development of the old St Ends building in Lower Baxter Street that now dominates the skyline (in bright orange) and completely overwhelms the Town Council building on Angel Hill!	The building referred to reflects a contemporary approach to converting an already modern building. It would not be appropriate to construct a mock historic building in this context.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	This should form part of the overall plan proposed for the town centre	This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21698E	Stephen Mills	Churchgate Area Association		yes	As the CAA represents residents and businesses in the heart of the historic grid we strongly support policy BV27. However we are concerned about how the suggested opportunity for some development on the Leg of Mutton site complies with this policy. As it states in the document this site 'forms an important open area, protecting views of the town centre'. 11.5 goes on however to suggest that there is an opportunity for development at its eastern edge. Surely any development on this site would not comply with policy BV27. As suggested the development may include a hotel which we feel would be wholly inappropriate and contradicts policy BV27. We have been in contact with the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and requested them, as part of their own response to Vision 31 to suggest how this area might best be developed as a green area both for wildlife and people, and blending in with No Mans Meadow on the other side of the river Lark.	Noted. It is not intended that the whole of this area would be developed but that by allowing a small commercial development along the eastern edge the remainder of the site could be opened up for public use as suggested by the CAA. Without some form of development, public use is unlikely to happen on this privately owned site.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	Again the way the question is put is leading the respondent to give the answer you seek. I agree the aspirations. I do not agree 14.7a, b or h. Bury is an historic site. It isn't Disneyland or an interactive virtual reality site to amuse children for an afternoon. Theme based trails, country parks - why? It is more expensive, and it ruins the site for those who simply want to see the town au natural. I first came to Bury as a tourist in the mid 1960s. Coach tours came from Essex to see the Abbey ruins. I was enchanted. I have lived here since 1967 as a result. Bury has changed in that time, but the historic sites have been largely unchanged and thus unspoilt. I use the old adage again - it ain't broke so don't fix it. Save our money for something else.	Thank you for your observations	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 40: Conserving the Setting and Views from the Historic Core (BV27)

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the content of policy BV27?	Question 40b - If not, what changes would you like to see, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	The Angel Hill area as a whole should be include in the list of those views given "particular regard"	Noted. The area is protected due to it being in the conservation area, the status of the listed buildings and the fact that the Abbey Gardens are a scheduled Ancient Monument.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes	The land adjacent to river Lark south of rugby club should be open space accessible on foot from Abbey Gardens to connect Nowton Park and should not be the route of a new road taking traffic to Sudbury which should, if needed be routed in a less spacial place.	This is an aspiration in the Green Infrastructure study and is included as a priority project in Policy BV28.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15697	Dr W. R. Little			yes	<p>Yes, this designation is needed in order to protect such areas from hostile and unsuitable development. The broad planning policies of the Local Development Framework will not be sufficient to protect specific sites such as these. The Council should also be proud to promote such areas in its official documents.</p> <p>Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens should be designated. I also believe that areas such as Sharp Road and Hardwick Lane should be considered for designation as they are spacious and attractive areas with large gardens and generous spaces between houses.</p>	<p>Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15698	Mrs Little			yes	<p>This designation is needed in order to protect such areas from hostile and unsuitable development. The broad planning policies of the Local Development Framework will not be sufficient to protect specific sites such as these. The Council should also be proud to promote such areas in tis official documents.</p> <p>Home Farm Lane (south) and Hardwick Park Gardens should be designated. I also believe that areas such as Sharp Road and Hardwick Lane should be considered for designation as they are also spacious and attractive areas with large gardens and generous spaces between houses.</p>	<p>Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15709	C R McNair			yes	It is of the essence that such designations are introduced. The low density, large gardens, spaces between houses and general attractiveness of such areas place them at risk from unsuitable and hostile development. The word 'residential' should precede the word 'areas' in the title so they are specifically identified and not confused with other special character areas such as conservation areas, parks, attractive aprst of the countryside etc.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	C R McNair				<p>The general over-arching planning policies are insufficient to control hostile development in such areas. In light of the new planning laws that gives "presumption in favour of sustainable development", it is important that precise guidance is given to developers as to where development can or cannot take place.</p> <p>Policies should therefore be introduced for Areas of Special Character to ensure there are minimum plot sizes and density compatible with the area, a restriction on backland/frontland development and further guidelines on what is or is not acceptable in development terms.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	C R McNair				Please include the southern side of Hardwick Lane, Sharp Road and home farm Lane (south) and Hardwick Park Gardens, Westminster Drive and the western end of Westley Road. These areas have the qualities I described above and are all similarly at risk from unsuitable development.	See above	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define these areas as the protection of such areas will be addressed through other documents in the Local Plan	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15735	Natalie Schultz			yes	<p>Yes, it is of the essence that such designations are introduced. The low density, large gardens, spaces between houses and general attractiveness of such areas place them at risk from unsuitable and hostile development. The word 'residential' should precede the word 'areas' in the title so they are specifically identified and not confused with other special character areas such as conservation areas, parks, attractive parts of the countryside etc.</p> <p>Please include the southern side of Hardwick Lane, Sharp Road and Home Farm Lane and Hardwick Park Gardens. These areas have the qualities I have described above and are all similarly at risk from unsuitable development.</p>	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes	Water-meadows, fishponds area as far as rugby club.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes	The 'ordinary' countryside. We do not want to be a city with everything covered in concrete	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes	Notably the whole of the Special Landscape Area across the southern edge of Bury should be protected from development.	The special landscape area designation already helps to protect against inappropriate development through policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes	The 'ordinary' countryside should be protected and not replaced with townscapes. The residents do not want to be living in and walking around an extended town environment.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society strongly supports this policy and aspirations. However we query when we will see the report currently being prepared in respect of the town centre.	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact. The town centre masterplan will be produced at a later date after the adoption of the Vision documents	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes	The 'ordinary' countryside should be protected and not replaced with townscapes. The residents do not want to be living in and walking around an extended town environment.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes	The countryside. On the A143 an open field will not be seen until well pass the Bunbury Arms this is over 5 miles. Before open field ie Suffolk	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale				Jacqueline Close (as discussed above) as Green infrastructure - not currently on your map. Woodland at Minden Barracks (already marked on your map).	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	I do not dispute the need for a special policy in this regard, but as stated above I consider this document so seriously flawed that any special policy could not mitigate from it and it will be compromised and subsumed.	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			yes	Firstly, we are supportive of the contents of policy BV 27. Secondly, relating to this question, we feel that the views from Westley Church, and back from the Linnet valley should be permanently preserved. We would propose that, with support from SEBC, we intend to embed this aspiration in a local Neighbourhood Plan.	The intention to produce a neighbourhood plan is noted	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			We do not consider that a separate policy is required to protect these areas. We suggest that it could be made the second part of Policy BV27 which could become Conserving Settings and Views from the Historic Core and Areas of Unique and Special Character.	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes	Most important to guard the uniqueness of the town.	This is an aspiration of the Vision document	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			yes	Great Barton	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15948	David Evans			yes	we believe that in our area Hardwick Lane, Sharps Road, ome Farm Lane and Hardwick Park Gardens are areas of risk from unsuitable development and need protection.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15951	Mollie Evans			yes	we believe that in our area Hardwick Lane, Sharps Road, Home Farm Lane and Hardwick Park Gardens are areas of risk from unsuitable development and need protection.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes	The 'ordinary' countryside should be protected and not replaced with townscapes. The residents do not want to be living in and walking around an extended town environment.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton				The Priors should be designated as a 'Village' and investment made to modernise the street scene. A master plan should be devised in conjunction with Havebury to manage the area more effectively than at present.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes	The surrounding countryside bordering Bury St Edmunds should not be an extension of the townscapes. A distinction is required as identified in the Core Strategy. This must be in consultation with those neighbouring village communities.	This strong urban edge is acknowledged and can be carried forward with the new strategic areas of growth.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Rougham Airfield	Rougham Airfield has been recognised in Policy BV22. Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	If you want to be 'low carbon' etc as per questions 24/25, you need to be more flexible with what is allowed (windows and doors) in conservation areas, so those buildings conserve heat/energy.	Conservation Areas have controlled development through the removal of certain permitted development rights in order to protect the historic character of the area.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes	Possibly but not if it includes the bus station, beach huts on stilts and the barrage balloon (Debenhams).	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	Area to western side of town alongside the River Linnet.	This is an aspiration in the Green Infrastructure study and is included as a priority project in BV28	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	Area of green amenity land at the bottom of Mount Road and the farm land between this and Symons Lane. (Symonds Road) This is a green buffer between Moreton Hall area and the town and should not be part of any development.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			We would draw the Council's attention to the areas of surviving historic meadows within the floodplains of the Rivers Lark and Linnet. These areas, outside the two conservation areas, are of special character. The meadows are, however, included in the Area of Archaeological Importance (Appendix D of Bury Vision). The meadows are an important historic asset, a rare surviving element of the historic landscape. A number of the drainage ditches are still preserved as landscape features in these areas. Ram Meadow, for example, defines the extent of the medieval settlement area in this part of the town. Historical evidence confirms that the meadows were managed at least from the medieval period and there is circumstantial evidence that the monastic fishpond, created or enhanced by Abbot Samson in the 12th century, extended into this area.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			There is also potential for sensitive archaeological remains to be preserved in these areas, including water channels, wood-lined leats, fragile palaeo-environmental deposits, as well as the possible remains of the monastic fish ponds associated with the Abbey. They would benefit from more active conservation, sensitive enhancement (and access) and promotion - to the benefit of the local community.	See above	No changes required
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society believes that further designations needs to be based upon a thorough understanding of the significance of the areas concerned. It is essential that townscape characterisation informs further local designation.	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	<p>Our Petition Relates Specifically to this Question.</p> <p>Our petition of 28th April 2011 from 107 residents of the Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group makes it clear that designation is of the essence. This should be introduced with clear policies on how development is carried out in such areas. We believe there may need to be an entry or cross referencing in the Draft Development Management Policies document in a similar manner to that introduced for conservation areas, though without the same degree of restrictions.</p>	The suggested criteria are somewhat limited to the characteristics of the respondents own neighbourhood and do not necessarily reflect the important character of other areas. Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission.			<p>We would prefer that the designations be called Residential Areas of Special Character to define exactly what they are and not to be confused with other areas that may be regarded as special such as conservation areas, public greenswards, parks etc. Whilst we agree that such areas are 'Special' we are not sure the word 'unique' in the title is quite appropriate.</p> <p>Definition of [Residential] Areas of Special Character Whilst they are not generally of sufficient historical or architectural value to warrant conservation status, they contain the following attributes:</p>	Each planning application should be taken on its merits. Special characters can be very different from one another, the policy could equally be applied to high density or small properties where the form of development contributes to a particular special character.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Michael Schultz	Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			<p>A distinctive and definable area, neighbourhood, or group of dwellings where the majority of houses have a high degree of residential character, desirability and amenity that enhances the urban fabric of the town.</p> <p>A low density of development and high spatial standards with relatively large properties [4 bedrooms+] when compared to most other neighbourhoods in the town.</p> <p>They contain large, well landscaped gardens with extensive space around and between dwellings.</p> <p>Established trees and bushes and sometimes nearby or adjoining public green spaces such as grass verges, heathland or countryside, help to soften the effect of the urban area.</p> <p>The large gardens, trees/shrubs and landscape dominant forms provide valuable green access corridors for a variety of wildlife to the open countryside and a 'lung' for the urban environment.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>The low urban density helps to prevent excessive demand on transport and public services, reduces the impact of neighbourhood noise and helps maintain biodiversity. It can also play a useful role in assisting the Council's climate change agenda. [Taken from a report released by Environmental Protection UK, June 2010]</p> <p>There is a high demand in the local housing market for such properties.</p> <p>Protection Required for Areas of Special Character Having said that there are Areas of Special Character in the town [Vision, page 72 and Core Strategy, page 42, item 4.46] it would be incomprehensible not to say where they are and why they special. It also follows that anything special should have protection. The Council say that they should be protected in item 14.20 page 72 of Vision but consider that other LDF documents will provide this.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>Having examined all LDF documents, including the draft Development Management Policies Document, it is clear that they will provide inadequate or dubious protection, principally because they are broad instruments that can be interpreted in a number of ways, and not site or location specific. [page 10 of Vision , item 1.28]. This gives the opportunity for owners/developers to exploit shortcomings in the broad policies and build a case for planning approval which, if resisted by the Council, could be attained on appeal.</p> <p>To properly protect things, one must surely be very specific. In view of the new National Planning Policy Framework, Item 14 and 15, which states there is to be 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development' it is incumbent upon the Council to ensure that owners/developers know where they can or can't develop and what polices they must follow [Item 154 of the National Planning Policy</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>Two examples of why additional protection is needed is demonstrated in planning applications SE/07/0844 and SE/07/0705, approved by the Council. This shows front-land development and site cramming of the worst kind and represents a gross over-development of the plots when compared with those in the area.</p> <p>Policies To Prevent Unsuitable Development</p> <p>The designation should be accompanied with policies that ensure minimal change occurs to the area and environmental qualities are protected. These should include:</p> <p>Maintenance of low residential density to accord with that existing in the area.</p> <p>Spatial standards of new development, plot width, garden depth and plot ratio, space between proposed dwellings and the side boundary shall all accord with that prevailing in the area.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>The general height of existing buildings in the area shall not be exceeded.</p> <p>Back-land, front-land and infilling development not to be permitted. New development to take account of existing front and rear building lines. Existing mature trees and landscaping to be maintained.</p> <p>Conversions of houses to flats or for commercial use will not be acceptable.</p> <p>Creation of access roads through plots in order to develop land within, beyond or adjacent to the area will not be acceptable.</p> <p>Alterations, extensions, annexes etc to be allowed provided they follow policy 24 of the Draft DPD.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				Many Councils have designated [Residential] Areas of Special Character and introduced policies for protection similar to the foregoing. They play a major role in maintaining the attractiveness of the Town. Without them, the Town would be poorer and consist principally of high density housing with small gardens and no residential or landscape character. This is linked with residents' No. 1 concern from the last round of consultation [Item 1.30. Page 10 of Vision] that "there is concern that the town will be over-developed and that crowded housing will result"	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>b) Are there any parts of Bury St. Edmunds (outside of conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?</p> <p>Please set out your reasons</p> <p>Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens. This area should be included for the reasons laid out in our petition and application document of April 2011. This area, the extent and boundaries of which is defined in the application document, fully satisfies the criteria laid out above.</p> <p>Sharp Road. This road is very similar in all aspects to Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens and satisfies similar criteria.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				Part of Hardwick Lane. [The whole of the southern side of the lane, the northern section from a point opposite the Hardwick Shopping Centre to a point opposite the entrance to Hardwick Heath, and the whole of section that turns alongside the hospital at its junction with Vinery Road] Whilst this road doesn't enjoy the tranquillity of the foregoing areas due to the busy road that intersects the main eastern part of the Lane, and the setting is not quite as cohesive, all the other attributes are present. Westminster Drive.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz				<p>Westley Road. Both sides of the road, western end from No. 142 [evens] and 109 [odds] travelling westwards.</p> <p>There may be more. However, it is clear that the numbers that could qualify are few making the case for protection for what we have that much stronger, before they disappear.</p> <p>The spaciousness of these areas compared with the rest of the Town can be clearly identified on the Bury St. Edmunds map - Inset 1, which was distributed with the hard copies of the Vision Document.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16029	Tomthy Cotter, Vanessa Cotter and R J Chappell			yes	<p>Yes, it is of the essence that such designations are introduced. The low density, large gardens, spaces between houses and general attractiveness of such areas place them at risk from unsuitable and hostile development. The word "Residential" should precede the word "Areas" in the title so they are specifically identified and not confused with other special character areas such as conservation areas, parks, attractive parts of the countryside etc.</p> <p>The general over-arching planning policies are insufficient to control hostile development in such areas. Policies should be introduced to ensure there are minimum plot sizes and density compatible with the area, a restriction on backland development and further guidelines on what is or is not acceptable in development terms.</p> <p>Yes, please include Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens, Sharp Road and Hardwick Lane. These areas</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	Division between town and countryside to the north to be retained as existing	This strong urban edge is acknowledged and can be carried forward with the new strategic areas of growth.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			yes	Yes, there are many. These can best be identified on an individual basis by the local people that know and value them, and protected or enhanced accordingly. Small details can mean a lot. Give time and care to these.	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21304E	Kate Stittle			yes	The flood area between ram meadow and Compiegne way. This is a beautiful area, full of wildlife. Everyday i see foxes, deer, phesants and i regularly hear owls at night. It's used by many people for dog walking, my children play there daily and i feel privileged to live opposite it. It would be a disaster if it were to be built on.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes	Council cannot be trusted with this though!	The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes	The area of land west of Rougham Hill known as 'The Leg of Mutton Field' should be protected. This precious space provides the important historic setting and identity of the town.	The site is designated under BV21 for outdoor recreational use and associated facilities. The area will be protected from inappropriate development under Policy BV27. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes	All of the area around the Abbey. Hardwick Heath, Nowtown Park. Stop urban sprawl into the villages. Keep the main roads into the town open with lots of trees.	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes	The ordinary countryside should be protected and not replaced with townscapes.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes	The countryside needs to be preserved.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21698E	Stephen Mills	Churchgate Area Association		yes	We do feel that there should be greater importance given to protecting green spaces in and around Bury St Edmunds to ensure that these spaces are protected for the benefit of local residents, and that they are protected for the future from any development. For the CAA this particularly applies to the Leg of Mutton site, and No Man's Meadow, for which St Edmundsbury has a limited lease until 2020 as a nature reserve. If by having a special policy and designation for unique areas we would strongly support that.	The countryside is protected under policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Joint Development Management document. The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul	Body and Mind Studio	Risbygate	no opinion		Thank you for	No changes

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		The council has not sought to specifically identify and define areas of special character as sufficient policies are either in place or emerging that will offer safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal will have a detrimental impact.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes	<p>The villages like Westley and Fornham All Saints need protection.</p> <p>The Abbey gardens/ruins must be protected.</p> <p>Residents of the town (who after all are your electorate and mandate providers) do not want townscapes. They want countryside. If they wanted this, they wouldn't live in Bury. Some people do move away from Bury; most however don't because what is here, is so special and so (as yet) untarnished by the sameism you see in most towns in the UK.</p>	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes	Yes, including all of Hardwick Lane, Stonebridge Avenue & Hardwick Park Gardens. These attractive individual low density residential properties with large mature gardens enhance the street scene. One or two of the properties in the past have been the subject of intense/backland development. However, so far through the planning system, the applications have not been successful and the general area of the area has been maintained.	The suggested criteria are somewhat limited to the characteristics of the respondents own neighbourhood and do not necessarily reflect the important character of other areas. Special characters can be very different from one another, the policy could equally be applied to high density or small properties where the form of development contributes to a particular special character. There are policies elsewhere in the Local Plan which prevent areas from unsuitable development	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 41: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 41b - Are there any parts of Bury St Edmunds (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes	The transition from an urban landscape to rural is evident and pronounced leaving Bury. This characteristic should not be lost and requires consultation. The avenue approach to Great Barton along with the permanent pasture adjacent.	This strong urban edge is acknowledged and can be carried forward with the new strategic areas of growth.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	See response form Bury Society	Sufficient policies are either in place or emerging, that will offer the safeguards and criteria for assessing whether a proposal would have a detrimental impact. Identifying specific areas of "character" risks overlooking other areas that will consequently lead to a presumption in favour of development. Each planning application should be taken on its merits.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes	See answers to 9 and to 41	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes	Again, I think the actions do not go nearly far enough to achieve the aspirations and most of them are re-active rather than proactive. I am also concerned that the historic and natural environment is the last theme to be tackled in this document, and seems to be tacked on rather than being at the core of the vision for the town. I would urge you to give it a higher priority, since, as the Prince's Foundation note, the town's spectacular built environment is its greatest asset. It's also unique. You can build any number of new developments, but old buildings and old towns once lost are lost for ever, and the town's unspoilt character would be even easier to lose.	The fact that this theme is the last one to be addressed in the document is no reflection on its importance.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society strongly supports this policy and aspirations. However we query when we will see the report currently being prepared in respect of the town centre.	Planning to address the issue of the report being prepared.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15879	Mr Graham Mackie	Scouts			<p>The provision of Scouting throughout Suffolk generally is provided by volunteers many in uniform with long term commitments to scouting and the support structure's developed from families of the youth we support, the ages from 6 to 18. From 18 onwards adults are included until they pass-on, one of our active scouters is 84 years old and still supports us at Great Barton.</p> <p>have briefly scanned through the Bury St Edmunds and the Rural documents and see no mention of the provision for Scout Groups.</p>	See below	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr Graham Mackie	Scouts			<p>At present the District Team supports Scouting in the following places:</p> <p>Bury St Edmunds: 1st Bury - Tollgate Lane 6th Bury - College Lane 10th Bury - Hardwick Middle School Grounds Portakabin</p> <p>Rural: Scout Hut - Great Barton Playing Field Scout Portakabin - Horringer Nr the Community Centre 1st Honing - St Edmunds Church RAF Honing Ixworth - Ixworth Community Centre and Middle School Lake - Back Street Millennial - Scout Building St Andrews Street Millennial</p>	The important work of volunteers (which includes Scouting) is recognised throughout the document. In particular reference to culture and leisure, it is recognised that volunteers and community groups have a significant role to play in delivering aspirations 1 and 3.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
					<p>1st Red Lodge - Red Lodge Millennium Centre Lavender Close Thurston - Cavendish Hall Church Road Thurston Bradfield Park Campsite- Suffolk facility An opportunity to contribute to the Vision 2031 is therefore very important, as we have a vision of our own for growth nationally.</p> <p>www.scouts.org.uk/vision2018</p> <p>Our contacts are:</p> <p>District Commissioner - Mr Keith Barber Deputy District Commissioner - Mr Paul Stafford District Chairman - Mr Paul Ruthven County Commissioner - Mrs Jenny Mullan</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
					I have attached a couple of promotional leaflets for your info, they have the contacts for Great Barton only, but are generic for anywhere.		
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15893	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			We look forward to be included in the Vision 2031 (See attached leaflets)	The Council welcomes the support from Natural England	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			<p>The document needs to replace reference to the draft NPPF with reference to the NPPF; the newly adopted document includes key amendments, including greater protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Section 11 of the NPPF provides useful guidance for local authorities in preparing Local Plans which will contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</p> <p>This document recognises the importance of the natural environment for people and wildlife, seeking to ensure that all new development will respect Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We would recommend that this wording is tightened to identify that '....all new development will seek to protect and enhance Breckland Special Protection Area....' in line with statutory and national policy requirements.</p>	The Council welcomes the support from Natural England	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			<p>Natural England supports the Plan's objectives and aspirations, particularly in relation to the historic and natural environment, travel, landscape, health and well being and sustainability and climate change.</p> <p>We welcome proposals to protect, maintain and enhance the natural environment, including designated sites and areas of local importance for wildlife. We particularly welcome proposals to promote the management, understanding of and connectivity between these areas and to engage the local community. The section on green infrastructure recognises the need to plan positively for green infrastructure as part of sustainable development and climate change mitigation and adaptation. We are pleased that GI, as part of development, will seek to be multi-functional and be based on the objectives and aspirations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, including the need for high quality GI linkages.</p>	The Council welcomes the support from Natural England	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			Reference should be made to the crucial role of well designed multi-functional accessible GI in diverting additional recreational pressure, through growth, away from more sensitive areas such as European sites and SSSIs.	Agree. A new policy on GI has been inserted. The Council has an adopted and up-to-date Green Infrastructure Strategy that, through implementation, seeks to reduce the pressure created by residents of St Edmundsbury. However, we also recognise that the Brecks acts as a recreational magnet for the wider region and that more strategic action may be required to ensure the population growth in the rest of the East of England does not undo what the Borough Council is seeking to achieve.	New policy on GI inserted

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal has not identified negative impacts on any national or European designated conservation sites although a number of site allocations are within close proximity to a number of these statutory sites.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome recognition that future development should protect, maintain and enhance the natural environment we believe Section 14 of the Plan should be strengthened to ensure development proposals seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible. This can be achieved by ensuring planning permission is refused if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for (Section 11 of the NPPF provides further detail).</p>	Agree	Amend Section 14 of the SA and provide cross references to other local plan policies and the NPPF

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>We are generally satisfied with the methodology and assessment presented in the report and believe this is in line with the requirements of the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010.</p> <p>The HRA considers the potential negative effects of increased recreational pressure, associated with increases in housing as a result of the Plan, on areas of Breckland SPA. Whilst we do not disagree with the conclusion that any increase in visitor numbers is unlikely to result in a significant effect we would suggest that consideration is also given to the mitigating effects of alternative strategic and local green infrastructure which the Plan is promoting through development. The provision of sufficient high quality accessible green space is a crucial factor in diverting additional recreational pressure away from more sensitive sites, including European sites and also SSSIs and other sensitive areas.</p>	<p>Noted. A Green Infrastructure Strategy has been adopted which seeks, amongst other things, to provide more locally accessible green space and recreational facilities in order to reduce the potential for trips into the Brecks SPA and other sensitive sites.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England			You should refer to our response to the Core Strategy for further comments on specific policies and sites. (Also entered as response to the SA (BVSA2) and HRA (BVHRA1).	Noted	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	Proposals are insufficient, lack clarity and are too vague to provide any proper protection to the unique historic and natural environment features of the area. There has been a wholesale failure in the past to have proper regard to the historic environment - witness the failure to conduct a proper historic buildings survey and archaeological survey with respect to the Arc/Cattlemarket Development in 2005-2007. As a consequence the approach of the Borough remains inadequate.	Disagree. The conservation areas of Bury St Edmunds are regularly reviewed and their significance is well documented. Conservation Area Appraisals have recently been published. The Council dedicates significant resources to enabling owners of historic buildings to maintain and preserve the historic quality and distinctiveness of the area.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15931	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency			Green Infrastructure can provide numerous multi-functional benefits including sustainable drainage, pedestrian transport areas and biodiversity improvements (such as wildlife corridors). Therefore, we support section 14.2 to include two Conservation Areas in Bury St Edmunds.	Thank you for your comments.	14.2 has been deleted as this related to the consultation on the change to conservation area boundaries which is now complete

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>We agree with the approach proposed in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The thematic and spatial connection of historic and natural assets, the use of new technology to enhance appreciation and interpretation and the involvement of the local community in this. 2. Integrated green infrastructure. 3. A high standard of design reflecting local characteristics. <p>We support the concept of the Green Corridor linking Moreton Hall to Fornham and the River Lark corridor through the use of existing network of public footpaths and bridleways albeit better accessed and connected.</p>	Noted	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>We note the aspiration within the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS) towards a 'new country park' to the north of the town where there is currently no public access to open areas. We would highlight that feedback from our community engagement is that local residents would prefer the existing landscape condition to be retained as much as possible in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field boundaries. 2. Arable use and management. <p>We submit that there needs to be greater certainty on the aspirations for the 'new country park' within the Action Plan in support of future masterplanning and to what extent this 'needs to be factored into land use budgets' as set out in the GIS.</p>	<p>There remains a shortfall of large and accessible open areas in the north and east of Bury St Edmunds. It is considered that planning for population growth in these areas should take the opportunity to address this need. this should be explored as masterplans for new development are worked up, recognising the importance of existing field boundaries and assessing how a balance could be achieved.</p>	<p>The Concept Statements have been amended to clarify this matter.</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party			While we agree with the aspirations for the historic and natural environment it should not be thought, in relation to the natural environment, that what is planned in terms of providing greenways and amenity space will fully compensate for the large areas of countryside on the periphery of the town that will be lost to new housing. Notwithstanding this it will nevertheless be important to provide all the compensation reasonably practicable by the creation of new areas of woodland, parkland and pasture - and, no less important manage them for wildlife benefit as well as public access.	There remains a shortfall of large and accessible open areas in the north and east of Bury St Edmunds. It is considered that planning for population growth in these areas should take the opportunity to address this need. this should be explored as masterplans for new development are worked up, recognising the importance of existing field boundaries and assessing how a balance could be achieved.	The Concept Statements have been amended to clarify this matter.
BVR15940	Joan Dean			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15941	Colin Murphy				<p>I would like the development of Bury St Edmunds (centre and suburbs) to be enhanced by including protected areas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 'green oasis' areas for quiet recreational activities such as walking, bird watching, fishing and model boating * existing water areas - such as the British Sugar lagoon - to be developed as recreational areas - ideal for model boating, walking, bird watching * 'active sport' areas for ball games, cycling, skateboarding - away from the 'green oasis' areas * more allotments and initiatives to encourage town people to grow their own, get active and help with the environment (I've been on the waiting list for years by the way) <p>I expect you are aware that there are a number of organisations that might wish to get involved in helping to develop such areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Suffolk Wildlife Trust * Saxon Model Boat Club * Bury St Edmunds Angling Club * RSPB * Woodland Trust 	<p>Vision 2031 recognises that there are many needs for recreation across the existing population. A Green Infrastructure Strategy, referred to in the document, has been prepared to maintain and enhance existing provision and, where possible, encourage new facilities. A new policy has been inserted to clarify the priority projects to be delivered. However, the Borough Council acknowledges that it cannot provide all this alone and that many other organisations and private landowners will also need to be encouraged to join in.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure policy inserted</p>
<p>Responses submitted via email and post March - April 2012</p>							

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Murphy				<p>I live in the centre of Bury for convenience and everyday enjoy the few oasis areas in the town and would love to see this expanded. I believe that town and country can and should enhance each other.</p> <p>I'm a member of the Saxon Model Boat Club and I'm expressing the 'model boating' view on behalf of other members of the club who previously had an arrangement with British Sugar to sail on the lagoon. The membership of the club was extensive at that time and had clubs from other areas visiting to take advantage of the great facilities. We'd like to see this returned.</p>	While the Vision 2031 document cannot make specific provision for the Model Boat Club, it is acknowledged that there is a demand for facilities for a wide range of clubs and activities and it may be appropriate for the Council to help empower groups and clubs with negotiations and securing funds and facilities.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15965	Gloria Davies	Lark Valley Association			<p>1) Support Project 1.2 to provide improved links between Fornham St Martin and Bury St Edmunds</p> <p>2) Support Alternative site of Project D.1 for new community parkland/nature reserve on British Sugar restoration site</p> <p>3) Support Project D. 7 for wetland green space alongside River Lark and A134</p> <p>4) Support concept of green corridor along River Lark to the south (upstream) of the Abbey Gardens.</p> <p>5) Do not support route south of Bury being designated Level 2 corridor (all the way to Bridge Farm) but consider it should be Level 1 rather than as shown through Hardwick Heath.</p> <p>6) Support Project D.2 to provide a route around the town. (We note the term radial is used for this concept and regard this as incorrect, the correct term being circular, radial being like the spokes of a wheel)</p>	Support noted and welcomed. A GI Policy has been inserted to clarify the priority projects to be delivered. Acknowledge potential confusion between radial and circular.	Green Infrastructure policy inserted

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email and post March - April 2012	Gloria Davies	Lark Valley Association			<p>7) Support the concept of bridging the A14 shown to the East of Bury, to enable circular route D.2 to be achieved, but do not support the omission of such a link to the West of Bury, where the circular route around Bury is shown to be within Bury, at West Suffolk College, and not beyond Bury Golf Club as should be the case.</p> <p>8) Support Project D.5/6 to create woodland planting along A14 approaches, but consider this concept should be extended along the entire length of the A14.</p> <p>9) Do not support the community allotments shown beside the river Lark. The majority of the area shown has been, and in our view should remain as water-meadows.</p> <p>10) Do not support the concept of the Level 1 green corridor north from the Abbey Gardens being routed along St Andrews Street North. Would support the route being along the River Lark from Abbey Gardens.</p> <p>11) Do not support Project D.11 Flood attenuation at No Mans Meadows. This area is part of the natural flood plain of the River Lark and should remain so. It should not be urbanised, which is what SUDS is all about.</p>	<p>Comments and support welcomed. The projects listed are contained in the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy that was prepared in consultation with local communities in 2009. Local community consultation will take place prior to any projects being implemented.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure policy inserted</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15983	Paul Elkin				<p>3.1 One of the Arc's few redeeming features (other than the Apex as a well designed performance and concert venue) is the construction of living accommodation above the retail units. The look and style of the rest of it is aggressively modernistic and low grade and it has given Bury the same dismal and outdated urban retail precinct that many towns are now trying to move away from.</p> <p>3.2 One way I think the balance of historic town centre could be restored is to pursue a policy of encouraging all existing retail premises to have the best possible 'look' to their shop fronts by eliminating wherever possible modern bland predominantly 'plastic' and garish brand signs above the main windows and again, whenever possible reinstating traditional often timber fascias with roll-out awnings that can be pulled out to shade seating areas outside cafe's or shelter in wet conditions for passers-by wanting to look at window displays.</p>	Noted. The Council does seek to limit the introduction of "corporate" signs in shopfronts, especially in listed buildings. A shopfront design guide has been adopted and referred to on these occasions. The matter will be addressed in more detail when the Town Centre masterplan is prepared at a later date.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Elkin				<p>It may sound old fashioned but it would have a surprisingly effect on reintroducing considerable variety to the increasingly bland look of retail premises at street level throughout the Butter Market and Abbeygate Street.</p> <p>3.3 Also for the long term, I think every effort needs to be made to ensure full use is being made of the upper floors of every one of town centre's older retail premises, the vast majority of which started life as residential properties and only gradually changed to retail premises during the later nineteenth and throughout the twentieth centuries.</p>	<p>The Council's Strategic Housing service has been successful in facilitating the re-use of upper floors for homes. However, the nature of access, security requirements and the difficulty of meeting fire safety standards in listed buildings conspire to making it difficult to achieve in some buildings. However, this initiative will continue to be pursued when opportunities arise.</p>	<p>Reference is made to bringing flats above shops back into use in 28e</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Elkin				<p>Where it can be demonstrated that only partial use for retail or office purposes is being made of upper floors above a street level shop, then I think a vigorous policy of encouraging developers or existing property owners to look at ways of returning unused spaces into residential accommodation. Albeit on a far bigger scale in a far bigger city, I have experience of this being done to great effect in central Bristol where both former offices and upper floors of some retail premises is being redeveloped and/or returned to residential accommodation. I appreciate there might be many access and building issues to be taken into account but I am sure if applied vigorously to retail premises throughout the centre of Bury St Edmunds, it could add greatly to the town's stock of rented homes as well as bringing more residents right back into the heart of the town.</p>	<p>The Council's Strategic Housing service has been successful in facilitating the re-use of upper floors for homes. However, the nature of access, security requirements and the difficulty of meeting fire safety standards in listed buildings conspire to making it difficult to achieve in some buildings. However, this initiative will continue to be pursued when opportunities arise.</p>	<p>Reference is made to bringing flats above shops back into use in 28e</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes	We support the need for a high quality built and natural environment and for new communities to be designed drawing on those existing local qualities. The most appropriate forms of green infrastructure will need to be tested through the planning process	Noted	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Insufficient definition provided. Not clear enough what the detailed proposals should be.	The two aspirations and consequential actions are concerned primarily with protection of the historic and natural environment and taking a holistic view of green infrastructure.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>In general, we support the Vision 2031 and the emphasis on the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the Historic Environment, and the proposal to strengthen the existing policies (though we wonder whether this is possible, given the advanced progress of the development management policies).</p> <p>In particular, with the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, which replaces PPS 5, it is crucial that the strategic policies in the Local Plan are reviewed and strengthened to deliver conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, including landscape.</p> <p>We welcome the commitment in Chapter 14 to improve walking and cycling links as part of the natural and historic environment. In addition, we would advise that the Vision 2031 should include Management as well as maintenance and Promotion as well as enhancement.</p>	agree - aspiration 1 should be amended to include reference to 'management' of the historic and natural environment	Amend aspiration 1, paragraph 14.3

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			It should relate to specific sites and buildings (and their settings) and also to the wider historic landscape (and sites in their landscape) and settlements. Direct feedback to the Vision was given by SCC Archaeological Service at the Historic Environment focus group on 22 March. At that group, we made the point that many of the actions are very general while others are quite specific. There could usefully be a middle stage between aspiration and (specific) action, e.g. aspiration strategy (specific) action. Some of the actions need to be made more robust and achievable. A useful further action would be the creation/compilation of local lists of local or undesignated heritage assets, recognising that the majority of heritage assets are undesignated and of local and regional significance (see below).	Conservation area appraisals have been undertaken and a register of historic assets at risk in Bury St Edmunds and the county have been completed. These are available as background documents for the Core Strategy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>Any proposals to develop areas of new green space, and green infrastructure, should consider the historic landscape character and use, to ensure that these are in keeping with, and respect, historic land use, and historic land boundaries and divisions. This can be achieved by the appropriate assessment of the historic landscape at an early stage in any development plans to ensure historic landscape features are - wherever possible - maintained, enhanced and promoted.</p> <p>Lastly, we feel that this document could be improved with a more explicit link between the annotated map in Figure 7.2 and policies; the borough council's strategy for improving green infrastructure could be clearer.</p>	A new Green Infrastructure policy has been inserted which sets out the priority projects to be implemented.	New policy on GI inserted
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments) This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications.		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Broadly yes, but we don't think it is necessary to make 'gateways' to an area. How much of this work is really necessary? We are a rural town and as such already have a wealth of public footpaths that access the countryside, which are easily identifiable and used by a good proportion of the public. Also, it would seem that much of the landscape improvements are on private land/farmland. For instance, the landscape enhancement to the area to the South of the Town [Project E2 and D8] seems to cover farmland and a special landscape area, which surely doesn't need enhancement? We would like further information about these proposals. Any plans should, in any event, be agreed by local residents before they proceed. We are also worried about who pays for any enhancements. Such cost should not fall to the council tax payers.	A new Green Infrastructure policy has been inserted which sets out the priority projects to be implemented. Opportunities to undertake the projects will be undertaken in association with new development, where appropriate.	New policy on GI inserted

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email and post March - April 2012	Michael Schultz	A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	New policy on GI inserted

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	No not all.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			yes	As above	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes	Re Aspiration 1. 14.9 is very important.	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Yes	Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		yes	Yes. Woodland Ways offers and hopes to contribute to implementing actions within Moreton Hall (aspiration 1)	The Council welcomes the support from Woodland Ways	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21591E	H I Quayle			no	The map on page 71 of "Bury Vision 2031" shows Project D.I. "... new community parkland", as part of a "gateway" site. "Bury Vision 2031" explicitly states that "the identity and segregation of Fornham All Saints should be maintained", and this is best achieved by retention of the land between the village and the relief road as agricultural land, continuing the locality's links with agriculture and providing an appropriate segregation zone. In any case, there is no lack of semi-natural green space in northern Bury, as any on-site field trip will clearly show.	There is an identified lack of accessible open space in the north and west of Bury St Edmunds. While agricultural land is open, it does not allow access for recreation purposes in the same way as parks and playing fields which are close to where people live. Agricultural land has no protection from future development beyond those designations in the current plan.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 42: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the historic and natural environment?	Question 42b - do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball					Noted	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			yes	New green spaces should be designed after consultation with local residents/amenity groups	Green spaces provided as part of development will be subject to local consultation.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	As I've said several times in this response, the town centre needs to be completely car-free except for residents, supported by electric buses & taxis serving outlying estates and collector hub park-and rides at points on the periphery or further out (Ixworth, Kentford, Woolpit, Cockfield, for example). To do less than this or to leave it too long will be to risk, in the short-term, throttling the town centre with queues of cars at peak times and, in the longer-term, turning it into an unachievable destination except for the very rich or the very near. The council should be in the business of ensuring fair and equal access for all its residents.	Thank you for your comment. Transport issues in the town are addressed in section 7 and shall feature in the future Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	We don't need any more shops, just encourage independent traders into vacant properties in the older part of town. This is what makes Bury unique. We have enough 'same as anywhere else variety' in the Arc. Don't price out visitors with exorbitant car parking or you will have a ghost town	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur. There are a variety of car parks across the town to meet peoples needs.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	There is no requirement for any more shops. Independent traders should be encouraged into vacant properties in the older part of town by reviewing rating levels etc. The proliferation of small independent shops is what makes Bury unique and should be supported. There is sufficient representation of national chain stores in the Arc and elsewhere in the town. The town should not price out visitors with exorbitant car parking or it will become a ghost town. Comparisons of parking prices and shop vacancies with other towns are not relevant we should protect our own town.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur. There are a variety of car parks across the town to meet peoples needs.	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	There is no requirement for any more shops. Independent traders should be encouraged into vacant properties in the older part of town by reviewing rating levels etc. The proliferation of small independent shops is what makes Bury unique and should be supported. There is sufficient representation of national chain stores in the Arc and elsewhere in the town. The town should not price out visitors with exorbitant car parking or it will become a ghost town. Comparisons of parking prices and shop vacancies with other towns are not relevant we should protect our own town.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur. There are a variety of car parks across the town to meet peoples needs.	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Town centre must be developed for cyclists and pedestrians together. Other aspirations and policies require it. Eg Abbeygate Street is not really a shared space in the usual sense. Pedestrians do not share the space with cycles when vehicles are banned. Make this a true shared are along with eg Looms Lane, St Johns Street etc. Develop cycle network within the town centre with adequate capacity and facilities (eg cycle racks - even Boris Bikes as in London). See link to Sustrans in q22.	Thank you for your comments. The town centre is to be subject of a separate masterplan that will seek to address these issues.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no	There needs to be a full and comprehensive assessment to ensure that there is proper regard to Bury St Edmunds as a surviving example of a historic market town and its architectural, historic and cultural significance. The town has an existing medieval plan structure but this has been disregarded on every level by the Council.	Agree with the need for full assessment, but strongly disagree with latter statement. The existing medieval plan structure has been foremost in all development in the town centre, including the Arc development which is set out on such principles.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Utilise empty shops first before developing more.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		yes	These aspirations are supported. It is essential to ensure that the town centre remains vibrant and attractive.	Noted	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15940	Joan Dean				Much more information required. Empty shops do nothing to improve the look of the town centre.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Reduce rates		
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Encourages more out of town shopping.	Disagree. Document supports use of existing buildings in town centre and supports potential for future development.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton				Eliminate on-street parking from the town centre and make Angel Hill a public open space with no through traffic. It's a scandal that vehicles are allowed to pass within five metres of the Cathedral and the Abbeygate	Thank you for your comment. This issues is recognised in the document and shall feature in the future Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	no	Waitrose supports the aim for a vibrant and attractive Town Centre with a varied retail offer (paragraph 15.1.1). Waitrose is however concerned that the supporting text under 'Aspiration 1' refers to developing the Town (paragraph 15.4.a). This should explicitly refer to the 'Town Centre', as opposed to the 'Town'. An additional paragraph should be included under Aspiration 1 to refer to directing future retail development to the Town Centre in the first instance, in accordance with the sequential approach outlined in the NPPF>	Agree - and action 28a has been amended to include the word 'centre'.	action 28a has been amended to include the word 'centre'.
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	There are no suitable car reception areas and subsequent ride facilities to the town centre. Therefore the move towards pedestrian preference must be gradual. Bury relies on the tourist season to remain a vibrant area	Thank you for your comments. These are noted. Wider transport issues are addressed in section 7.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	Again, the council seeks licence to waste money on something not needed. There is little wrong with the Buttermarket and Cornhill. If you want to stop cars accessing the area, just stop them but without wasting money on new and probably inferior paving. Councils claim to have no money and clearly have no inclination to deal with existing problems, so choose to revert to what they like doing best; wasting money on unnecessary schemes preceded by glossy brochures and a claim to be listening.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Care with cutting vehicular access to town centre - what about deliveries, refuse collection and customers collecting heavy goods.	Thank you for your support. The details of service access shall be considered along with any detailed plans.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Too many restaurants, betting shops, and charity shops. Small interesting shops closing.	The Council is keen to ensure that there is a wide variety and shops, restaurants and facilities in the town. The Council works with national and local retailers to ensure this mix.	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	BSE is already large enough and many shops are unfortunately empty. Do not spoil what was a beautiful town with further development.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			yes	15.6b More action than investigation will be required. as will be as important if the town expands as suggested in questions 44-48.	Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	A proper link (i.e. take out some buildings) between the market area and the Arc should be a priority as 'promised' originally by the land authority.	It remains an objective to achieve this but it is not financially viable at the time. This is a matter of detail for the town centre masterplan	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council does not oppose these aspirations for the town centre, and welcomes the principle of a vibrant town centre retail offer based on a pleasant and historic built environment. We wonder why the borough council has drafted a policy on a town centre masterplan for Haverhill, but there is no equivalent policy for Bury St Edmunds. A key aim of the council's transport strategy is to support the economic growth and prosperity of the area. Improving the pedestrian environment is also consistent with the LTP.	A masterplan shall be produced to address this issue. A new policy has been inserted on the town centre masterplan	Additional paragraphs and a new town centre masterplan policy added in section 15.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16018	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		<p>1. Introduction and Background</p> <p>As you are aware from our previous representations, we act as planning consultants for Barclays Bank plc ('the Bank') in respect of Local Development Framework (LDF) documents for St. Edmundsbury and this letter forms the Bank's response to the above document. We understand from Planning Officers that the 'Vision 2031' documents are in effect Area Action Plans (AAPs) for each of the locations covered. As a long-established business, the Bank has made a substantial contribution to the vitality and viability of the Borough over the years that it has traded and as a significant stakeholder within the Council's area it is therefore concerned that development plan policies should not fetter the important contribution that it makes to the vitality and viability of town centres.</p>	There are policies elsewhere in the Core Strategy and Development Management document against which town uses are assessed. Town centre uses in Bury St Edmunds will be further considered in the production of a town masterplan which will be subject to full public consultation at a later date.	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		<p>We have responded on behalf of the Bank to a number of LDF consultation documents for St. Edmundsbury including the Core Strategy and Development Management DPD and in January 2012 we responded to the consultation on the Joint Development Management DPD for Forest Heath and St. Edmundsbury. We emphasised that financial services retailers generally, and the Bank in particular, play a key role in promoting town centre health through high attraction of footfall so the provision of financial services should be allowed to improve and evolve alongside improvements to shopping provision envisaged by the LDF.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		2. Representations on the Consultation Document The St. Edmundsbury Core Strategy (Policy CS10) emphasises the need to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Borough's town centres, seeking investment that will help to retain consumer expenditure. It is therefore critical that policies in the Vision 2031 document support those objectives and do not discourage the private sector investment necessary to fulfil them. The Vision document recognises that Bury St. Edmunds Town Centre 'serves as more than just a destination for shopping trips' and that in their wish to maintain and improve the vitality of the town the Borough Council 'will encourage a mix of uses which satisfy that aim' (Section 15). At this stage of 'Aspirations' it is not clear what form the AAP will take and whilst we note the intention to prepare a masterplan 'at a later date' in full consultation with businesses and organisations, it is imperative that the Vision 2031 AAP for Bury reflects the policies that will be used for development management in the Town Centre.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		Aspiration 1' recognises the threats to high street trading and the need for encouragement to maintain and enhance the offer, including action to 'provide for other town centre activities' (Paragraph 15.4), reflecting the stated intention of the Council who 'wish to maintain and improve the vitality of the town and local centres and will encourage a mix of uses which satisfy that aim' (Joint Development Management DPD para. 7.4). Our representations on the Joint Development Management DPD criticised Policy 33 for sending mixed messages by stating that the LPA will support proposals which would secure the vitality and viability of the Primary Shopping Areas but suggesting that any changes from A1 use may have a detrimental effect. It then sets out a purely arbitrary restriction of the number of adjoining non-A1 uses without any robust evidence for doing so.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		<p>The 2009 St. Edmundsbury Development Management Preferred Options document acknowledged that other uses such as A2 'are essential to the vitality and viability of town and village shopping centres' (para. 5.11), but despite this and the evidence previously provided by the Bank to St. Edmundsbury Council, outdated assumptions about the way in which financial services retailers such as the Bank operate seem to persist.</p> <p>'Aspiration 2' sets out proposed actions including a statement that 'Through widespread consultation, we will prepare a separate, more detailed, masterplan for the town centre'. All DPDs must be founded on sound evidence but to date the Council has produced no evidence to support restricting uses such as the Bank in Primary Shopping Areas or Frontages. If the Council is serious about process of 'widespread consultation', it should recognise the clear evidence already provided by the Bank of the beneficial effect of its operation.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		<p>We hope that by providing that evidence yet again in response to this document, the Council will revise its approach as the Vision 2031 and Masterplan documents evolve.</p> <p>The documents comprising the LDF provide the opportunity to revise out-of-date local planning policy but the Council's vision and aims for Bury St. Edmunds' Town Centre are not compatible with limits on the Bank's presence in the Primary Shopping Area as such unjustified restrictions are likely to work against their and the Government's objectives of promoting vitality and viability. The Council's vision of a vibrant and viable town centre will clearly need the support of the private sector investment from businesses, including financial service retailers such as the Bank, which play an important role in attracting footfall, promoting vitality, underpinning town centres and assisting in regeneration. Planning policy should focus on the quality of the occupier, not on maintaining an arbitrary level of a particular use class.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		On the matter of policy formulation, PPS12 is clear that all DPDs must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and • the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives' and must be • 'consistent with National Policy' 	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		Policies seeking to limit certain Part A uses in Primary Shopping Areas derive from outmoded and discredited thinking that other uses such as A2 detract from the vitality and viability of town centres. By definition, uses that fall within Part A of the Use Classes Order are appropriate in town centres as they are 'shopping area uses' and are acceptable without any need for restriction or qualification. This is particularly the case for the financial services sector. ODPM Circular 03/2005 'Changes of Use of Buildings And Land' which accompanied the last major revisions to the Use Classes Order specifically states in relation to the A2 Financial and Professional Services use class (which was created to separate those uses 'serving the public, from other office uses not directly serving the public' - paragraph 32), that the Class is also 'designed to allow flexibility within a sector which is very much a part of the established shopping street scene, and which is expanding and diversifying'.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		The uses within Class A2 are noted as being those 'which the public now expects to find in shopping areas' (paragraph 38). The wider role played by town centres than a pure shopping function is recognised throughout Government policy on town centres. Government Policy in PPS4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth' continues the thrust of policy in PPG6 relating to town centres. The strong emphasis upon the promotion of town centre vitality and viability remains in the current PPS and the Government is clear that there should be a positive attitude towards all development which generates wealth and creates employment. The 'overarching objective is sustainable economic growth' (paragraph 9). The Government wants town centres to offer 'a wide range of services to communities in an attractive and safe environment and remedying deficiencies in provision in areas with poor access to facilities'.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		There should be 'enhanced consumer choice through the provision of innovative and efficient shopping, leisure, tourism and local services in town centres' (paragraph 10). Policy EC10.1 states that: 'Local planning authorities should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning applications for economic development. Planning applications that secure sustainable economic growth should be treated favourably'. There is nothing in Government policy that recommends or supports imposing restrictions upon acceptable town centre uses at all and indeed Policy EC3.1 states that local planning authorities should 'set flexible policies for their centres which are able to respond to changing economic circumstances'. It is therefore essential that planning policies should facilitate the positive approach required by PPS4.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		Promoting vitality and viability in town centres are objectives of the Government and the Council. To succeed, town centres need to provide a full range of services and these often need to be located in ground floor premises in accessible locations. Indeed, Class A2 retailers such as the Bank routinely experience very high levels of customer visitation, contributing significantly towards pedestrian movement and therefore the vitality and viability of town centres. The Bank has undertaken a number of comparative footfall surveys in connection with its current acquisitions programme at its branches in various towns and cities in the UK (copies at Appendix 1). These conclusively show that the level of footfall associated with Bank branches is commensurate with, and often higher than, the best known national multiple Class A1 traders.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		Banks also have moved away from the traditional style of frontage, preferring to have an open, visually interesting and attractive face to the 'high street'. The Bank has become increasingly retail in its presentation and has introduced an innovative 'flagship' branch design, which has been developed in association with its customers, to transform banking into what it terms as 'a retail focused experience'. The Bank estimates that some 10 million customers use its branches each week and through listening to their feedback, a design has been developed that meets their requirements for modern banking and provides branches similar in appearance and in operation to retail shops. This is an example of the 'enhanced consumer choice through the provision of innovative and efficient shopping, leisure, tourism and local services in town centres' that PPS4 expects and to which all DPDs must also positively respond.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		Whilst the design of every new branch has to be flexible in order to be sensitive to the requirements of each building occupied, the aim is generally to ensure that over 70% of the internal space at ground floor is accessible to customers. The Bank's managers regularly report that upon the opening of a 'flagship' branch the customer visitation levels significantly increase and thus the level of activity helps to underpin pedestrian flows to the benefit of surrounding traders. It is therefore important that planning policy recognises the benefit of bank uses in fostering footfall and pedestrian activity and that it should not resist much needed investment by financial service retailers.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		The Bank's footfall surveys have been a key element in helping to change attitudes towards the presence of banks in core shopping areas and primary frontages. Even planning authorities that once strongly resisted Class A2 uses in their primary areas have granted permission for Barclays 'flagship' outlets. Examples of authorities that have recognised the wider benefits of the 'flagship' design (following receipt of applications which have been supported by evidence of high footfall), include Southampton, Reading, Manchester, Milton Keynes, Romford, Southend, Leicester, Plymouth, Sheffield, Kensington & Chelsea and Cambridge. Follow up surveys were carried out in 2010 at Milton Keynes, Southend, Reading and Southampton (copies at Appendix 2). In every case the new 'flagship' branch significantly increased footfall, confirming the Bank's beneficial effect on vitality and viability.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		The Council's objectives will require major commitment and substantial investment by the private sector. Pursuing restrictive policies to keep significant generators of footfall such as the Bank out of primary shopping frontages will actively work against the achievement of those objectives and is an outdated and discredited approach. The Bank therefore considers that, in the light of its evidence and the statements of Government Policy in March 2011 by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Minister of State for Decentralisation, it is important that the Council uses the preparation of all the LDF documents to support those uses that add to the vitality and viability of the Primary Shopping Area.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		The Ministerial Statement of 23rd March 2011 by The Rt. Hon. Greg Clark MP is particularly relevant to these representations and to the eventual soundness or otherwise of all DPDs as it provides added emphasis to the Government's determination that planning policies and their implementation must facilitate economic investment and growth. The Minister said 'Government's clear intention is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes' - with the message that local authorities should plan positively for such new developments: 'Local planning authorities should therefore press ahead without delay in preparing up-to-date development plans, and should use that opportunity to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that this country needs'. The Council must use the Vision 2031 AAP to do so in respect of changes to retail frontage policy.	See above	No changes required
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		3. Conclusions The Bank's evidence of how it increases vitality and viability in primary frontages shows that there is considerable benefit in seeking to attract those A2 users such as banks who provide a high level of investment in, and maintenance of, their premises resulting in active and attractive street frontages. This will foster very significant footfall and pedestrian activity and attract investment by others, helping to provide the confidence and commercial viability necessary for the Council's strategy for growth and investment and regarded as vital by the Government.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Barclays Bank		In order to comply with the recent Ministerial Statement of Government Policy, the Vision 2031 AAP and the Masterplan for Bury St. Edmunds Town Centre must make it clear that uses such as shops, banks and building societies which contribute to the vitality, viability and diversity of the town centre will be encouraged and that such active ground floor uses will be appropriate in all designated frontages. This will help to deliver some of the Council's 'Aspirations' for the Town Centre.	See above	No changes required
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). We are in broad agreement with the aspirations. However, we believe the town centre, and particularly the historic heart, will be put under unsustainable pressure as the 13,000 people from the extra 5,900 houses that are proposed to be built in the Town, seek out these facilities and attractions.	Thank you for your comments. However, a larger population is expected to facilitate increased economic activity which can be accommodated in the town centre to create a vibrant area that can be utilised and enjoyed. A sustainable masterplan is to be produced that will provide further clarification on this matter.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	We must maintain the 'Market Town' nature and encourage independent traders. Presently rates etc and TOO high.	Rents are based on the market at that time and it outside of the council's control	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Not ambitious enough. Pedestrianisation needs to extend beyond Cornhill and Buttermarket. Please use the successful Abbeygate St model (i.e. no level - no curbs) more widely in town centre (see comment on question 22).	Thank you for your comments. Further detail shall be considered in the Bury Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no	It is time the town had a permanent park and ride facility	Thank you for your comments. It is not currently considered feasible to provide a park and ride service in the town based on current evidence. This matter shall continue to be investigated.	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	More parking less pedestrianisation & the council allowed the town to be ruined by the awful arc!	Thank you for your comments. Access to the town centre shall continue to be reviewed.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21445E	David Chapman			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21459E	Sarah Green			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		yes	Agree in the main but St Andrews Street South between Woolhall and Risbygate is a barren ugly space that is completely at odds with both the arc and the older town. Needs urgent and dramatic treatment!	Thank you for your comments. Further detail shall be considered in the Bury Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no	Aspiration 1 is fine in so far as it goes. Has thought been given to the increasing growth of on line shopping and the fact that the pattern of retailing is continually evolving. ? Important that there is sufficient car parking unless there are dramatic changes in the provision of public transport. Should be looked at as part of the proposed Bury Town Centre Report yet to be commissioned.	Thank you for your comments. Online shopping trends have been addressed in paragraph 15.2. The document seeks to accommodate potential future fluxuations in the economy and retail markets. Further detail shall be considered in the Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	Independent traders should be encouraged into the old part of the town by reducing rents. Car parking is too expensive, we should not be comparing our fees to those of Cambridge and Ipswich.	Rents are based on the market at that time and it outside of the council's control. There are a range of car parks in the town to suit peoples needs.	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		yes	It is essential that our Town Centre remains vibrant and attractive and the market is also an important part of this and should not be allowed to reduce in quantity or quality.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	There is no requirement for any more shops. Independent traders should be encouraged into vacant properties in the older part of town by reviewing rating levels etc. The proliferation of small independent shops is what makes Bury unique and should be supported. There is sufficient representation of national chain stores in the Arc and elsewhere in the town. The town should not price out visitors with exorbitant car parking or it will become a ghost town. Comparisons of parking prices and shop vacancies with other towns are not relevant we should protect our own town.	The document is intended to cover future development up to 2031, in which time variations in the market may occur. There are a variety of car parks across the town to meet peoples needs.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	Car parking charges need to be kept affordable. Independent retailers need to be supported and encouraged as they make the Town unique.	Car parking charges are reviewed regularly to ensure they are appropriate to meet the needs of the town and its visitors	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	Pedestrianise Market Square and surrounding area as described above.	Thank you for your comment. Further pedestrianisation shall be considered as part of the Bury Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 43: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with these aspirations for Bury St Edmunds town centre?	Question 43b - If not, please tell us why.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no	The Council has identified a need to plan for additional retail floorspace, and has also identified the importance of protecting the historic environment of the Town Centre and existing residential amenity, yet it is proposed to revise the town centre boundary to exclude the existing B&Q site on the corner of Risbygate. This site already benefits from unfettered non-food retail use and presents a suitable site through continued use/refurbishment/redevelopment to accommodate some of the additional town centre retail floorspace that is noted to be required without impact on the viability of the town centre, the historic core or the wider environment. Rather than excluding the site from the town centre at this stage in the plan making process, its contribution to the future vision of the towns retail centre should be assessed as part of the future town centre masterplan and not excluded from that process at this stage.	The removal of the site from the town centre boundary reflects the physical separation of this site from the town centre with road access from Out Risbygate Street. This does not effect the current uses on the site.	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Mobility should be paramount in the eyes of planners to retain town centre viability.	Thank you for your comment. Mobility and access shall be considered as part of the Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for your comment	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam				The arc has badly damaged the town centre in particular the market Why was the link not built? Yet again the Council has been rolled over by developers! Urgent action is needed to remedy this	It remains an objective to achieve this but it is not financially viable at the time. This is a matter of detail for the town centre masterplan	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			Section 16 discusses the Strategic Growth Areas, which seek to deliver much of the Borough's housing, yet there is no mention of the European Protected Sites which the growth could impact through recreational and urban effects. This should be remedied by the proposed submission version of the document in order to avoid any potential soundness issues.	Additional text has been added to the document around the SPA and the recreational pressures issue. This is also included in the revised concept plans for the strategic sites	Additional text has been added to the document around the SPA and the recreational pressures issue.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15766	Malcolm Johnson		FAS Parish Council		<p>This confirms my comment about different wording required on page 76 and page 94, regarding the Relief Road. The first states "Link road flows the existing ridge line...". The second "...utilising the existing ridge line to minimise its visibility in the landscape".</p> <p>The developers representative confirmed to me that the second quote is their intention (as the Parish Council understood to be the case from previous consultations) and the first quote not to be in the proposal. I'm sure you can see there is a difference.</p>	<p>The closure of Tut Hill will be an option, once the relief road is provided to create an alternative route around the village. It will be for residents of Fornham all Saints to influence to final decision.</p> <p>The concept statement identifies the extent of the buffer zone. It will be for the masterplan, in consultation with residents and the Parish Council to develop this further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Malcolm Johnson		FAS Parish Council		I will also take the opportunity to confirm the Parish Council's assertion that the 'Buffer Zone' could be adequately protected from future development, even if used as farmed land, by the establishment of a Community Land Trust as part of the planning process now taking place. The Trust would be a legal entity created to maintain the land as farmland in perpetuity, ensuring it with just as much protection as a park like Nowton Park. This would fulfil the long-term objective of avoiding the coalescence of FAS and Bury.	see above	see above
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15773	David Isaac			no	<p>I wish to comment on the proposal to build on the site adjoining the Howard/Mildenhall Estate.</p> <p>After attending the meeting held at the Howard Middle School on Friday 23 March 2012 I wish to voice my objections for the following reasons.</p> <p>To me the only gain for this development is profit for the development company. The affordable housing that is supposedly included in the development is not affordable to the majority of residents in Bury St. Edmunds.</p> <p>From the briefing given at the meeting by the developer's representative it appears that the occupants of the houses will be from outside the area, possibly as some attendees expressed, from London and perhaps Cambridge area. This is not acceptable for our country market town. The question of water supply was also addressed. Where is the extra supply coming from.</p>	<p>The principle of development in this area has already been confirmed by the Core Strategy. A range of housing will be required throughout the site, including housing which will be provided by registered social landlords, to cater for all needs and requirements. One of the reasons that growth is required is that people choose to move to this part of the country for a historic market town with plenty of green spaces, relatively low crime and good schools. We cannot prevent that, nor would we wish to, but we must accommodate it and protect that which we cherish. Anglian Water have confirmed that water supply is not an issue.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Isaac				<p>As there is a relationship to this project and the Howard Middle School plans access to the Middle School MUST be addressed and traffic problems resolved. No mention in plans of any additional development of industrial sites to provide employment. Is this an indication that no thought has been given to where the residents will work? Young people in the town cannot find work now. Additional houses without plans for work is not good policy.</p> <p>Additional traffic in Mildenhall Road/Fornham Road/Newmarket road will bring town to gridlock at times. Mention has been made of a Primary School but nothing is mentioned of families that may move in with Middle and Upper School age children. Has though been given to where they will go - the meeting didn't give that impression.</p> <p>In addition to the above, is it not the local community that decides what goes on their patch, is this not the policy of the present government?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the future structure of the education system in Bury St Edmunds is yet to be determined and alternative opportunities for primary school provision may arise. this may or may not include the existing Howard Middle school. However, until such decisions have been made, it is necessary to make provision within the site.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Isaac				<p>Additionally it was clear from the aforementioned meeting that local ward councillors and residents are not in favour of this development, why then is the Borough Council going ahead with these plans against the wishes of the residents. This appears to be democracy is reverse of what this country has enjoyed for many years.</p> <p>To sum-up my comments; Housing will not be affordable for majority of town residents. Additional traffic will cause damage to town and drive companies away. People will shop elsewhere due to additional traffic in Town area. More houses means more people looking for jobs that are already scarce. Middle and Upper Schools not addressed. Water supply critical.</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no	It swallows up far too much green space	The development will take place on agricultural land, but will create significant accessible open space.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't agree with developing this site at all, for the reasons given earlier.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Respect the views of local people about overdevelopment, and coalescence. Do not leave it to developers to come up with their preferred option, which will be the one that maximises their profit with the minimum acceptable level of quality.	The work undertaken by the developers has been developed in full consultation with the local community. The response to this latest consultation has informed the final concept statement prepared by the council. This can now be developed further with the local community through the development of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society supports the location of the new school adjacent to the new shops.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15875	Keith Mills			no	<p>After viewing the various options of Vision 2031 regarding Fornham All Saints & Tut Hill at the Community Centre last week and posting my comments, I spoke to one of the consultants at that meeting, and asked the question, "If it may be possible to GIVE that residents who live at the top of Tut Hill an extra piece of land on the end of their gardens, to give them an extra BUFFER from whatever the final outcome is". The consultant couldn't see any reason why this isn't a possibility. Not that he would commit to that comment of course. I still oppose the public right of way/park or whatever you want to call it - the land should be left as arable land to be farmer. We who live at the top of Tut Hill will lose a lot of value in our properties (not that you give a damn about that!) and after living here for 25 years don't want to be overlooked by the public who can then walk past our properties at all times of the day and night which would lower our security as well.</p>	The option of a land transfer to private individuals is a matter for the individual landowners involved.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Keith Mills				At least if we had a little bit more of a 'buffer' of extra land, this may help. All he wants to do is make as much money from this next project as possible and bow to whatever the Borough Council wants, at the end of the day, which is nothing like what the residents of Fornham All Saints want! But of course, from what I have seen and heard, that doesn't matter! The council will do what it wants!		
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15878	Yvonne Galloway			no	1) The building of a relief road through the development , whether it will take all through traffic away from Tut hill or not, will result in a VERY busy road. All of the proposals for this site include a significant area of 'open access land' or 'landscaped parkland' on the other side of this relief road from the housing development. There does not appear, however to be any indication of how pedestrians and cyclists are to safely cross this road. I would argue that there will be no way that the public can safely cross this road unless a series of footbridges or underpasses are built - preferable the latter. There is absolutely no way that pedestrian crossings , even with traffic lights would be safe , and they would, I believe cause an unacceptable hold up to the high volumes of traffic that would be using the road.	The need to provide safe crossing of the proposed relief road is acknowledged and needs to be developed through the masterplan process. Footbridges and underpasses are not universally popular with pedestrians on level ground. Traffic volumes through Angel Hill are very high, yet safe pedestrian crossing has been provided at the Abbey Gate, without holding up traffic. Similar forms of crossing may be feasible and should be explored.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Yvonne Galloway				2) Bus routes - The developers have stated bus links will be created from the new development into the existing Howard and Mildenhall Estates. One of these would 'probably' we are told, be alongside our house at 89 Clay Road, through existing woodland. I do not believe this link point is acceptable or possible. The width of the road from the proposed exit from woodland to the junction of Clay Road and Beard road could not, I believe, allow a car and a bus to pass each other and that stretch of road serves approx 50 houses in Clay Road and ALL the houses in Warwick Drive. ALL on road parking (including emergency vehicles and service vehicles) would have to be prohibited to allow buses to pass and turn corners etc and there are regulations concerning distance between passing places etc which I do not believe would be met. The recreational amenity of this part of the Howard estate would be severely affected.	The concept statement proposes a preferred bus route through the grounds of the Middle school. This would avoid Clay Road altogether.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Yvonne Galloway				<p>Traffic jams and loss of on road parking would create problems in adjacent roads and would severely affect the safety of e.g. children walking to schools and crossing roads.</p> <p>Because of the much narrower roads serving the newer houses on the outskirts of these estates, I think that the Borough Council are severely remiss to even consider development plans on this huge scale, which are dependent on being able to provide bus links when these access points have not been thoroughly researched as to whether they are possible. I would suggest the only bus links between the proposed development and the existing estates should be at the Howard Middle school and possibly onto Severn road towards the back of the Industrial Estate.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Yvonne Galloway				<p>3) Sustainability -There are no indications of the house type, sizes etc - I understand that this will be at a later date. There are however, a few points which should be considered by the Council and the developer when deciding what type of houses should be built.</p> <p>Ageing population - It is known that in 30 years time, there will be 30% more 65+ year olds than at present as people are living longer. There is not, at present enough suitable houses for older people who wish to carry on living independently. i.e. single storey, small, with manageable gardens. Whether they are included in the affordable housing ratio or not, there must be some provision for this segment of the population, in order to provide housing provision for the population of BURY ST EDMUNDS.</p>	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will have to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Yvonne Galloway				Also, in order to encourage the use of walking, cycling and public transport and try and minimise the use of cars, house design needs to lend itself to that i.e. there needs to be easily accessible back gardens, with ideally some sort of permanent outbuilding in which the family's bikes, prams etc can be EASILY put away, stored and taken out. Garages alone are not the answer - they are our official parking space for our cars.	These are sound issues which need to be addressed through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15880	Margaret Culpin	Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust Board		no	<p>The Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust wishes specifically to comment on the provision of an additional primary school which forms part of the Vision 2031 consultation for the development site by Countryside Homes to the north west of Bury St Edmunds. The Trust currently provides 9-18 education for pupils across Horringer Court Middle School, Westley Middle School and County Upper School. Barrow Primary School has applied to join the Trust and, from September 2012, the schools will work in the age range 4-19 in an all-through model of education. Howard Middle School's application to join the Trust is currently with the Department for Education (DfE). However, Colin Sinclair, the school's Head Teacher, is already a member of the Trust's management team. His involvement is key, given that the children from Howard Middle transfer almost exclusively to County Upper and are certain to continue to do so irrespective of the outcome of the school's application to the DfE.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the future structure of the education system in Bury St Edmunds is yet to be determined and alternative opportunities for primary school provision may arise. this may or may not include the existing Howard Middle school. However, until such decisions have been made, it is necessary to make provision within the site.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Margaret Culpin	Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust Board			<p>These changes regarding the education of the children in the west of the town have implications for the location of the new primary provision by the developers. The Vision Statement sites it in Fornham. However, the local authority, the developers, the Head and governors of Howard Middle and Trustees of the Academy Board have produced an alternative proposal (see attached). This proposes that a first school be developed on the site of Howard Middle School providing education from nursery through to age thirteen on one campus. This plan allows for the relocation of the current Howard Primary School to the Middle School site if the governing body accepts an invitation to do so. Additional leisure facilities would also be developed on this site making it an important community hub. The children would then transfer to County Upper at aged thirteen together with their peers from Horringer Court and Westley Middle Schools.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Margaret Culpin	Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust Board			<p>The site allocated for a primary school at Fornham should be protected against development initially in the event that more primary places be needed in the future. This proposal has been discussed by the Howard Estate Residents' Association and was very favourably received. It was displayed at the consultation meeting held on Monday 19th March 2012 and was also discussed at the meeting on the development chaired by David Ruffley, MP, on Friday 23rd March.</p> <p>This proposal enables the children who currently attend Howard and Tollgate primary schools, together with those who will live on the new Fornham development to access the all-through Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust schools. These will be their catchment schools.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Margaret Culpin	Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust Board			<p>There are wider benefits from this proposal. The Howard Middle site stands between the existing housing and the new development. By developing it as proposed, it will bring the two communities together. Furthermore, the developer's contribution will fund additional recreational facilities for both communities.</p> <p>We believe that this above solution is the obvious one educationally and has other considerable advantages as outlined. For these reasons, we urge the amendment of the plans in line with our proposals.</p>		
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15920	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council		no	<p>The Parish Council would like to ensure that the development, with reference to paragraph 16.6 bullet point 4 'delivers around 900 homes of mixed tenure and size, including affordable homes', has homes that are of benefit to local residents and dwellings and that reflect local housing needs as it has concerns over the economic viability of affordable housing in the current market.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 16.6 bullet point 6 the Council would wish to see firm commitments given as to the range of facilities that would be available prior to development as there could be a direct impact on existing facilities and would also request that Fornham All Saints be included within the public transport link to be provided for the new development 'to the town centre and other locally significant leisure, employment and service destinations' (paragraph 16.6 bullet point 7).</p>	The elements referred to in paragraph 16.6 are all taken directly from Policy CS11 of the adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, there is already a firm requirement for these matters to be addressed.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<p>Finally with reference to the development in principle the Council is also concerned at the level of traffic accessing the town centre and can foresee an aggravated traffic problem at the Tollgate Traffic Lights. Council would request that consideration be given once again to the proposal for a new road over the River Lark utilizing the old Padley's site linking the A1101 and the roundabout at the top of Barton Hill on the A134.</p> <p>The Parish Council would also like to take this opportunity to make reference to the proposed "green parkland" development between the planned "Bury North" development and Fornham All Saints as mentioned in the St Edmundsbury Green Infrastructure Strategy by way of the following points:</p>	<p>Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<p>• On page 32 of the strategy there is an assertion that 'there appears to be a deficiency of semi natural green space in the northern part of Bury St Edmunds' and looking at figure 3.1a this appears to be the case. However, if designations given for other areas of the plan are used, a completely different conclusion is arrived at. The following areas should be included on Figure 3.1a as semi natural green space:</p> <p>a) The Suffolk Golf Club (as Bury Golf Club is already included)</p> <p>b) All the agricultural land between the River Lark and Fornham St. Martin (as the leg of Mutton Land is)</p> <p>c) The triangular field (containing an ancient monument which is not referred to within the Strategy) between Pigeon Lane and the A1101</p> <p>d) The agricultural land between Bury Golf Club and the A1101.</p>	Access to footpaths across agricultural land does not constitute an adequate substitute for access to areas of open space and parkland. These facilities are deficient in this area.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<p>All these areas of land have public footpath access either through them or alongside them, unlike Bury Golf Club land and can be rightly considered accessible by the public. We therefore contend that there is no shortage of semi-natural green space in this area and therefore no need to provide any within the Vision 2031 proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should also be noted that on figure 3.1 the only reference to golf clubs are to Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. No reference is made to either Flempton Golf Club or the Suffolk and Country Golf Club. 		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to the Green Infrastructure Opportunity Map the Parish Council would like to make the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Council is totally against the concept of a new/improved 'gateway' site in Fornham All Saints. It sees no justification for a gateway for Bury St Edmunds being located within its village. The independence of villages around Bury (and Haverhill) is supposed to be a guiding principle of Vision 2031. The siting of this 'gateway' would be counter to this principle. b) If required the 'gateway' should be located at the perimeter of the expanded Bury not within what remains of Fornham All Saints. c) The site proposed in Fornham All Saints for the 'gateway' parkland would mean the removal of an existing football pitch and allotments, which would surely provide an indicator of how poorly this proposal has been thought through with no local input. 	The Green Infrastructure Opportunity Map forms part of the adopted Green Infrastructure Strategy. As such, it is already in existence, and reference to it in the Vision 2031 document is for information. It does not suggest, nor imply coalescence of villages with Bury St Edmunds.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<p>d) The Parish Council also notes that a similar concept for a gateway to Bury is proposed in another village (Horringer) which it also suggests should be kept independent of Bury.</p> <p>e) There appears to be no intention to extend the level 2 circular green corridor around Bury between Westley and Fornham when both areas are subject to development and where the provision of such a green corridor should be provided.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis of the plan is the St Edmundsbury Borough Council 'Open Space Assessment 2005' which appears to have some inaccurate land use designations which are further repeated in figure 3.1a of the Green Infrastructure Strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) All the water meadows alongside the River Lark between Compiegne Way and Bury Town Football Club are shown as allotments, which they have never been. b) The same designation of 'natural/semi natural urban green space' is given for no mans meadow/leg of mutton (in actual fact farmed agricultural land) and half of Bury St Edmunds Golf Club (the other half being designated as 'Outdoor Sports'. c) There is no reference to the Suffolk Golf Course which should also be indicated on figure 3.1a as although outside Bury Town Boundary, so at the time of this assessment was that section of Bury Golf Club designated as 'Outdoor Sports'. 		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs V Waples	Fornham All Saints Parish Council			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council is concerned that the list of stakeholders who attended meetings does not appear to include any elected representative and does not appear to include any from the surrounding parishes of Bury and Haverhill and yet it is on their land that various proposals are suggested. • The proposed next steps do not include any proposed involvement with locally elected bodies whilst the whole tenant of the report is an example of 'we will tell you what you want', the complete opposite of any local involvement. 	Development of the masterplan will require the involvement of all stakeholders including elected representatives and residents of Bury St Edmunds and Fornham All Saints.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15935	Richard Russell				4) <input type="checkbox"/> Specifically relating to the proposed new housing areas in the north west and south east. These are shown as coming too close to the A14, and one can see now what a miserable living environment this provides alongside the A14 in Stowmarket. Future generations will surely be aghast that this proximity was ever allowed whilst leading to such levels of pollution in people's houses and gardens.	At its closest point, the proposed site is in excess of 800 metres from the A14. This is considerably greater distance than many existing residential areas.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	Segregation needed between existing buildings and the proposed development.	The concept statement retains the existing tree belt to the rear of the Howard and Mildenhall estates. However, such separation should not be such as to prevent the development integrating with the existing.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes	Yes I agree with all five locations. I don't buy the 'concreting over the countryside' mantra trotted out by myopic politicians. Suffolk is a predominately rural county and these proposals won't alter that. In respect of preserving wildlife habitats, if a green field is built on, the little furry animals will simply hop off into the next field.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd		<p>Chapter 16 sets out the guiding principles for the future development of the Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p>Waitrose supports the development of the Strategic Growth Areas in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS11. However, any convenience goods development should be of an appropriate scale to support the needs of the Growth Areas and the proposed Local/Neighbourhood Centres, but not of a scale whereby it could compete with the Town Centre.</p> <p>Chapter 16 should therefore clarify that a retail Assessment will be required in accordance with the NPPF (paragraphs 24 and 26) and the 'Town Centre first' approach.</p>	Any retail element should be of a scale appropriate to serve the needs of the local community consistent with the concept of a walkable community. This is referred to in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process.	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	Recommendation: The Open Access land must be placed in perpetuity for the parishioners of Fornham All Saints.	The proposed development is an extension of Bury St Edmunds. The open access land should be available to all.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			no	You want green land between town and villages yet you are proposing to build on that green land. Traffic being pushed on to already over congested roads.	The concept statement provides detail about hoe that green space will be provided. This will be developed further through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	yes	The location of primary school and local centre may need to be reflected upon pursuant to discussions surrounding school provision in Bury St Edmunds and in particular the future of the Howard Primary and Middle Schools	This is noted.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion	<p>With the following four questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern over the number of houses to be built - no data i.e. population increase or availability of housing 2. What is the meaning (exactly) of affordable housing as used in the document? 	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. The term affordable housing is used to encompass intermediate and social (pr affordable) rented housing, irrespective of tenure or ownership (whether exclusive or shared) or by financial arrangements, that are available to people who cannot afford to rent or buy houses available on the open market.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			yes	Yes, abandon the plans for development.	This support is misplaced as it constitutes an unexplained objection.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>We do not object in principle to the preferred option for this site, but we would like to make the following brief comments on the option as based upon the presentation in this document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration might be had as to the way that this development will relate to adjacent employment land; how might the development encourage residents of the homes here to walk to their jobs on this employment land? • The Core Strategy requires community and leisure facilities to be included as part of this development, but it is not clear from this diagram as to where they would be located. We assume that these facilities would be clustered close to the retail and employment centre, but this perhaps ought to be made clear on this diagram. 	<p>These matters are addressed in the concept statement, but will need to be developed further through the masterplan process.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>• Whilst it is perhaps too detailed a consideration for this document, the Bury Vision 2031 document might set out a principle that each of the 5 strategic growth sites should be distinctive; a place in its own right, compatible with the character of Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>The county council is and will continue to work with the developer and the borough council on the development of this site, in relation to the county council's strategic and service delivery interests, and will make more detailed comments through this process. The details relating to the layout of this site may change as a result of this work.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16017	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the 'Strategic Growth Areas' are an integral part of the Core Strategy, nevertheless the Society questions the housing growth model upon which these are founded. The Society does not accept that growth is inherently sustainable and believes that the environmental, economic and social constraints to growth set out within the NPPF definition of Sustainable Development are not reflected in these figures derived from the East of England Plan. The Society believes that the aspirations of the local community for the future of their town are fundamental and should not be placed off-limits for future debate. A such, the level of housing growth is a fundamental issue that should not be excluded from consideration as part of any robust and inclusive Vision for Bury 2031. The Vision documents fail to explore the powers afforded to the local community by the Localism Act and Neighbourhood Planning in particular.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			It is possible that the application of a Neighbourhood Plan or several plans by the Town Council or neighbouring parishes could significantly change the emphasis and direction/character of development as envisaged by the District Council.		
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, that remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>					

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16024	Colin Sinclair	Howard Middle School			<p>The Vision 2031 consultation document details proposals for the development site by Countryside Homes to the North West of Bury St Edmunds. One of the proposals sites a new primary provision in Fornham and I wish to put forward an alternative proposal which I believe will have far-reaching benefits to the local community as well as providing a first class educational provision for the children currently being educated, and for the many generations to come.</p> <p>The Howard Middle School site is a fabulous site with excellent educational facilities including a self-contained Sports Barn with changing rooms, specialist teaching rooms for Science, Art, Design Technology, Food, Music and Dance. It also has an abundance of open playing fields which provides the children with a safe and secure environment in which to learn. The site is located on the edge of the proposed development at Fornham and our alternative proposal is to locate a new primary provision on the school site.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the future structure of the education system in Bury St Edmunds is yet to be determined and alternative opportunities for primary school provision may arise. this may or may not include the existing Howard Middle school and the council is grateful for the opportunity provided by the school for such discussions. However, until such decisions have been made, it is necessary to make provision within the site.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Sinclair	Howard Middle School			<p>The proposal is based on the premise that Countryside Homes would work in partnership with Howard Middle School and the Bury St Edmunds Academy Trust to build a new primary education (first school) provision on the existing Howard Middle School site, therefore providing education from nursery through to aged thirteen on one campus. The developers would also provide additional recreational and leisure facilities such as an all-weather flood-lit facility, a fitness suite and additional adult changing rooms. This would provide a significant boost to both the existing residents and be an additional attraction to new residents of North West Bury St Edmunds as the school would become the hub of the community providing facilities and amenities for the whole community.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Sinclair	Howard Middle School			Our proposal has been shared with members of the Local Authority (education, planning and recreation), David Ruffley, MP, local councillors and members of the local community including the Howard Estate Association of Residence and Tenants (HEART) group. The support for the proposal has been very positive with Suffolk County Councillor Mark Ereira providing financial support to transform my original hand-drawn concept plan into a professionally produced concept plan (which I have attached). Countryside Properties have been involved in discussions and are in support of the proposal.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Sinclair	Howard Middle School			<p>Furthermore, during two public consultation meetings held at Howard Middle School in March the proposal received a great deal of support.</p> <p>It is my belief that our amended proposal will not only provide enhanced educational facilities and generate much needed first rate recreational facilities but it is also economically and financially sensible. I urge you to consider the amendments to the proposal and I would be more than willing to expand on the proposal further as I believe this could be a significant development in shaping the future of our community.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		yes	ALL comments made at Residents presentation must be considered. Tollgate Lane/Mildenhall Road junction MUST be improved. All types of housing (although not 900) must be built (i.e. bungalows, low cost etc)	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The number of houses proposed has already been established by Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy adopted in 2010 following an examination in public.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Review the validity of the proposed development	It is assumed that this comment is questioning the validity of the housing figures, although it is not clear. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Less expansion into valuable cropland, ideally none. The level of expansion proposed (900 homes) is not a sustainable option. Small holdings (with associated homes) would be the sustainable option.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town. Smallholdings may be desirable, but to meet the housing requirements of the borough would consume far more countryside.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no	The problem is that whilst one does not want to be accused of NIMBYism there is no viable space between the current boundary of BSE (the Mercedes Benz dealership) and FAS to develop without compromising FAS's individuality as a village. It would simply become part of BSE and lose its identity. The parish council put forward a reasonable compromise but that has been ignored in its material terms. This site should not be used at all I am afraid. It is farmland now and that is how it should remain. If more housing is required in West Suffolk the Council needs to be more flexible with change of use of sites and buildings no longer needed by agriculture and related food processing industries; there are plenty about. This would produce both more concentrated towns and more dispersed rural development. In effect, a green belt should be set up around BSE and similar towns.	The number of houses proposed and principle of development has already been established by Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy adopted in 2010 following an examination in public. The concept statement clearly sets out how the protection of the identity of Fornham All Saints will be maintained. This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	Plenty of existing empty properties	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated by bringing back (the relatively few) empty properties which exist.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no	Open Access land could be misused. It would best remain farmland or failing that become a formal park that is properly maintained	The precise nature and extent of the open access land will be developed further through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no	Open Access land could be misused. It would best remain farmland or failing that become a formal park that is properly maintained	The precise nature and extent of the open access land will be developed further through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	<p>The development must include provision for a health centre/GP surgery and the following housing: Sheltered Accommodation Single storey dwellings Significant affordable homes Intermediate housing Low Cost market housing</p> <p>So that existing roads do not become 'rat runs' there must be rising bollards that only permit passage by buses and taxis on the link roads between the estates.</p> <p>Also the Tollgate junction/semi roundabout MUST be improved.</p> <p>All of this would create a true 'village' and the new and older areas would be enhanced and in harmony with each other.</p>	These are all issues which will be developed further through the masterplan and planning application process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21591E	H I Quayle			yes	<p>Overall, I agree with the preferred option as shown on page 76.</p> <p>However, three changes are required:</p> <p>a. the line of the relief road should be moved back slightly south-east, to follow the shallow valley running up from the A1101 (and NOT the north-west ridge of the valley)</p> <p>b. Tut Hill must become a cul-de-sac , being stopped-up near the point where the new relief road joins the existing B1106 near Bury Golf Club.</p> <p>c. As previously indicated, the land classified on page 76 as "Open Access Land"- the segregation zone between the village and the new relief road- must remain as agricultural land. A Community Land Trust (or similar) will guarantee its continued use for agricultural purposes.</p>	<p>The line of the relief road has been adjusted, but the principal of following the ridge has been retained. However, some cut and fill may be required to reduce the impact of the road in the landscape. The closure of Tut Hill is an option, but it should be for residents of Fornham All Saint to influence. Retention as agricultural land does not provide open amenity space, neither does it protect land from built development (agricultural permitted development). The nature of this area needs to be further considered through the masterplan process.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	the roads into Bury St Edmunds are not improving .Just a relief road that getting people in & out of the development Then what join the traffic congestion ?	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	<p>For all the reasons I have explained earlier in this response, I do not agree that this greenfield site be offered up as an 'oven-ready' sacrificial lamb to Countrywide. There are too many houses planned here. To put a retail business centre in the middle of what is now a field, is simply ludicrous. There will be a them and us culture with the Mildenhall estate. Brand new, up to the minute houses right next to old council houses. People from outside Bury will be able to afford them. The offspring of people on the Mildenhall Road estate, will not be able to afford them. If 30% is social housing, this means 70% isn't. 630 households; 2 cars average per household, 1260 more cars. If they all worked in Bury under your plan, they'd all get the bus to work. You'd need an awful lot more busses to cope.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. The purpose of the community hub is to provide a walkable neighbourhood. This is explained elsewhere in the Vision Document. One of the keys to a successful development is to integrate new communities with existing. This is detailed in the concept statement.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
					<p>The reality is though that Bury does not have 630 more jobs for people of the income bracket that will be buying these new houses. If they cost £300,000 on average, their owners won't be on a £25,000 salary. I don't see hundreds of jobs in the Bury Free Press every week for £25k plus. Where will they work? In Cambridge, Norwich or London or Ipswich. So, we will be a dormitory. Why us? Can't Ipswich provide their own dormitory? To say to us 'these new houses are for you!' as we've been told at two public meetings, is just rubbish. The young people of Bury can't afford these houses. They need social housing (which is what you told us at the two meetings I referred to).</p>	<p>A range of housing will be required throughout the site, including housing which will be provided by registered social landlords, to cater for all needs and requirements. One of the reasons that growth is required is that people choose to move to this part of the country for a historic market town with plenty of green spaces, relatively low crime and good schools. We cannot prevent that, nor would we wish to, but we must accommodate it and protect that which we cherish.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
					<p>Terry Clements said 2800 people are on the social housing waiting list, and so we must build more social housing. he said 30% of the 6000 new homes will be social housing (over the next 25 years). That means 1800 new social homes. That doesn't even provide enough homes for those on the waiting list now.</p> <p>Can you imagine what the congestion is going to be like on Mildenhall Road in the mornings with 900 new homes generating 900 journeys (even if only by bus!) every day?</p> <p>How will the social houses on this site get into town on Sundays? They'll be marooned.</p>	<p>A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.</p>	

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
					<p>What is planned at this site is just too many houses. It is not needed. These are people coming from outside Bury. They are thus not our problem. Our problem is social housing, and that problem can be addressed by building now on brownfield sites in the town.</p> <p>Where is the document that says these houses will be sold to Bury folk? Where is the document which says Bury's population will expand by 31% in the next 25 years?</p> <p>You will just cause more gridlock by these plans.</p>		
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 44: Preferred Option Strategic Site North-west

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 44a - Strategic site north-west - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 44b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Too close to Fornham All Saints even with landscape provision	The concept statement addresses the separation of Fornham all saints from Bury St Edmunds	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no	the proposed housing is too much and despite what is said will threaten Fornham's identity. The issues of water, roads etc have not been properly addressed. The impact on the Howard Estate will be severe	The number of houses proposed has already been established by Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy adopted in 2010 following an examination in public. All other issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no	I am concerned to hear that there could be a railway halt at the railway crossing which currently provides pedestrian access between Gt Barton and Moreton Hall and the cycle routes to and from town. This would completely change the rural side of the railway track at Cattishall. It also seems completely unnecessary with Thurston station and Bury St Edmunds station so close. Parking would be a big issue - surely some better station parking at public transport to stations would be the way to go.	There are no proposals for a railway halt.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes	Provision of improved road infrastructure and access to A14	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option (appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path</p> <p>The school should incorporate sufficient parking to compensate for the inadequate provision at the football facility. The school should use the football facility for its outdoor sports activity.</p> <p>The main flight path should be structural amenity space as per the Moreton Hall preferred option.</p> <p>There should be a road link (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Details of the parking provision required for the school will be addressed when the details of the school are being developed. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged. The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Respect the views of local people about overdevelopment, and coalescence. Do not leave it to developers to come up with their preferred option, which will be the one that maximises their profit with the minimum acceptable level of quality.	The work undertaken by the developers has been developed in full consultation with the local community. The response to this latest consultation has informed the final concept statement prepared by the council. This can now be developed further with the local community through the development of the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option (appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path</p> <p>The school could incorporate sufficient parking to compensate for the inadequate provision at the football facility. The school should use the football facility for some of its outdoor sports activity.</p> <p>The main flight path should be structural amenity space as per the Moreton Hall preferred option.</p> <p>There should be a road link (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Details of the parking provision required for the school will be addressed when the details of the school are being developed. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged. The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society considers the SEBC option to be much preferable. We can see no reason on the ground why the area to the north of the Thurston Road should be extended further eastwards.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option (appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path</p> <p>The school could incorporate sufficient parking to compensate for the inadequate provision at the football facility. The school should use the football facility for some of its outdoor sports activity.</p> <p>The main flight path should be structural amenity space as per the Moreton Hall preferred option.</p> <p>There should be a road link (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Details of the parking provision required for the school will be addressed when the details of the school are being developed. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged. The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15878	Yvonne Galloway						

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no	<p>We do not agree with the Preferred Option for the development of Moreton Hall.</p> <p>Our objection relates to the boundary of the area allocated to the north of Mount Road - see commentary and objection to Policy BV3.</p> <p>Insofar as the Preferred Option sets out basic principles for the distribution of uses across the general area we do not object. We agree the range of uses to be incorporated within the urban extension of Moreton Hall and agree the basic location of community uses in relation to The Flying Fortress PH, the location of an extension of the existing strategic open space west of Lady Miriam Way and the provision of playing fields for a prospective secondary school. We note the commitment to the alignment of the Eastern Relief Road arising from the adopted development brief and the grant of planning consent for the community football facility.</p>	See response to objection to BV3. Any extension eastward would create a precedent for extending further into countryside.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc		<p>Consequently the building blocks for detailed master planning are fundamentally established by, and reflected in, the Preferred Option - subject to determining a permanent eastern boundary north of Mount Road.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the delivery of a sustainable urban extension and the proper balance of land uses and ancillary provisions including landscaping should be the subject of detailed land use master planning based on the principles of good design, landscape integration, accessibility and so fourth.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey therefore wishes to express its desire to work with St Edmundsbury Council to develop an agreed master plan for inclusion within the Submission Draft DPD which may or may not reflect the Preferred Option.</p>	This is acknowledged and will need to be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Structural Landscaping very poor. * Where is adherence to parish boundaries (CS1 etc) * Urban sprawl towards East Barton * Breaks the north building line. Primary entrance / exit to Bury St Edmunds high density. A very poor thought of Bury.	Structural landscaping is addressed in the concept statement and will be developed through the masterplan process. The site fully accords with Core strategy Policy CS11 and does not conflict with CS1. Good design will avoid urban sprawl. There is no northern building line, other than that established by Policy BV3. The concept statement proposes a range of densities, with a soft, low density edge.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	As previously discussed.	Assume this refers back to response to Policy BV3 which is addressed at question 6.	No changes required
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	See previous answers.	Assume this refers back to response to Policy BV3 which is addressed at question 6.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	<p>Properties within this site that are all part of the Cattishall Hamlet have been ignored with no proposal for a buffer zone separating these properties with the new proposed development.</p> <p>The positioning of the school site would render the airfield useless.</p> <p>This proposed development is within the boundary of Great Barton Parish.</p>	<p>The development to the north of Mount Road will relate to that proposed on the south side of Mount Road, rather than the existing hamlet of Cattishall. However, screening and planting will be required to reinforce this. This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.</p> <p>The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones.</p> <p>The development may be within the parish of Great Barton, but it will be an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	<p>Properties within this site that are all part of the Cattishall Hamlet have been ignored with no proposal for a buffer zone separating these properties with the new proposed development.</p> <p>The positioning of the school site would render the airfield useless.</p> <p>This proposed development is within the boundary of Great Barton Parish.</p>	<p>The development to the north of Mount Road will relate to that proposed on the south side of Mount Road, rather than the existing hamlet of Cattishall. However, screening and planting will be required to reinforce this. This is a matter which will need to be developed further in the masterplan.</p> <p>The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones.</p> <p>The development may be within the parish of Great Barton, but it will be an urban extension of Bury St Edmunds.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option 1(appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path. This land should be set aside to provide a green landscape area with provisional parking to alleviate the misuse of Skyliner way and to provide overspill parking for the proposed Football facility until such time it is needed for school use.</p> <p>The school should eventually use the football facility for some of its outdoor sports activity.</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Manning				<p>The main flight path should be open green space or preferably allotments, providing for this side of town with priority offered to nearby residents. It should not be for additional housing as this would be overdevelopment and in contravention of the statements from the proposed developer provided in appendix 6</p> <p>Appendix 6 states 'It will be a place that people choose to live for the following reasons: it provides attractive well-designed houses' but the development of St Edmunds Gate, currently is far from this. Poor design of the overall layout leads to poor parking arrangement with too much `on street parking` and lack of garden frontage and very small rear gardens, hugely overlooked.</p>	<p>Until recently, all development was subject to a density directive, requiring higher densities. This has now been removed and a range of densities is proposed. Further detail can be found in the concept statements for the strategic growth areas. Parking standards which previously restricted the number of parking spaces which may be provided are also subject to review.</p>	

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Manning				it is set within an attractive environment with open space, trees, landscaping and other green infrastructure including allotments' - This statement whilst sounding great, has not been the case with previous developments so what will be different?? The LAP areas are so small they serve no purpose. Developers preferred option 1 would seem to be the best compromise should any development of this area go ahead		
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Too large - already developed enough.	The concept of the area being overdeveloped is not accepted.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	Building should cease now. Too much countryside has already been taken.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd		See 44	Any retail element should be of a scale appropriate to serve the needs of the local community consistent with the concept of a walkable community. This is referred to in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process.	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	Moreton Hall has outgrown	The principle of development in this area has already been confirmed by the Core Strategy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>The 2 properties in the parish of Great Barton in the proposed areas must be sufficiently protected as identified from the Core strategy. It would be unwise to site the school under the flight path of Rougham airfield.</p> <p>The Relief road must accord with the Core Strategy and the upgrade to the Rookery interchange has to a priority with SCC, SEBC and the Highways Agency</p>	<p>The setting of the two properties will be protected as far as is possible, although it will undoubtedly change. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones.</p> <p>Comments in respect of the Rookery crossroads and the Relief road are acknowledged.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Moreton Hall should not be further developed. The cramming that allowed over 270 extra dwellings means that the over-development will now be nearer to 800 than 500. The design proposals from the community were not accepted by the council who propose their own option. Go back and listen to the community as promised.</p> <p>Moreton Hall residents have suffered for too long at the hands of bad planning. Neither the county council nor borough council has any idea how to deal with current infrastructure problems and their proposed use of Urban Traffic Management and Control has not been explained because it cannot be justified. On what is known, it will not work.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Moreton Hall has accommodated the bulk of new housing and employment provision since the 1970s. However, the area now allocated only forms a part of the development proposed, with other sites spread across the town. Dispute the allegation that Moreton Hall has suffered from bad planning. It exists solely because of sound planning and has become a location where people continue to choose to live, with much evidence of people moving from one part of the development to another.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Trevor Beckwith				The relief road is for Suffolk Business Park and will not 'relieve' residential congestion. People will continue to use cars because they generally have little alternative. Being blamed by car-driving bureaucrats will not cause them to change.	The Eastern Relief Road will not be restricted to commercial traffic, it will be available for use by all. It will provide direct access to the A14 with an improved junction, including enlarged slip roads. Cars will continue to be accommodated, but not at the cost of all else. Alternatives for pedestrians and cyclist need to be provided. At present, residents of Thurston manage to cycle to town, passing through Moreton Hall on their route, so it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some residents of Moreton Hall may choose to do the same.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no	Hospital site here.	The location for the hospital has already been established by the Core strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Wootan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16002	Mrs Joyce Kirk			no	Already over-developed re housing. If new secondary school is built it should not be under the flight path at Rougham airfield. Bridge (railway) over Orttewell Road should be enlarged to facilitate 2-way traffic (help reduce one bottleneck) similarly bridge on junction below road. New school (secondary) should have sufficient car parking space for all staff (unlike sorting office) and there should be a safe designated area for students to be dropped off. Overall BSE is a nice place to live - don't spoil it.	The concept of the area being overdeveloped is not accepted. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Any alterations to road junctions need to be assessed as part of the town wide traffic assessment currently under way. Improving the bridge over Orttewell Road may encourage people to use Moreton Hall as a shortcut from the A134 to junction 44 of the A14. Parking standards which previously restricted the number of parking spaces which may be provided are subject to review.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no opinion	Given that in total 1350 new homes are proposed for the western side of Bury how is the transport infrastructure going to cope, given the heavy usage of Newmarket Road also? The building of a hospital will add to this considerably. Hospitals and housing do not sit happily together (see present situation) suggest hospital only or houses only.	This development is proposed on the east side of town. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Yes, abandon the plans for development.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>We do not object in principle to the preferred option for this site, but we would like to make the following brief comments on the option as based upon the presentation in this document:</p> <p>The proposed location of the Upper School is preferable to the location suggested by the Developer's preferred option; it being better related to the housing development and further from the proposed relief road which will potentially carry significant traffic off the A14.</p> <p>The Core Strategy requires community and leisure facilities to be included as part of this development, but it is not clear from this diagram as to where they would be located. We assume that these facilities would be clustered close to the retail and employment centre, but this perhaps ought to be made clear on this diagram.</p>	These matters are addressed in the concept statement, but will need to be developed further through the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			Whilst it is perhaps too detailed a consideration for this document, the Bury Vision 2031 document might set out a principle that each of the 5 strategic growth sites should be distinctive; a place in its own right, compatible with the character of Bury St Edmunds. The county council is and will continue to work with the developer and the borough council on the development of this site, in relation to the county council's strategic and service delivery interests, and will make more detailed comments through this process. The details relating to the layout of this site may change as a result of this work.		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, that remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>					

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	<p>The Structural Landscaping is very poor considering the synergy required/ talked about by STBC with the NE of Bury St Edmunds Development (Berkeley)</p> <p>Many Moreton Hall residents use this "path" to country "Freedom Feel "over the railway into Cattishall / Green Lane and its Bridleways and should be left more open / less house density should be applied to continually encourage this.</p> <p>Has totally ignored the Parish Boundary of Great Barton with NO Landscape divide to stop the Sprawl and on wards unabated to East Barton.</p> <p>This is an entrance to Bury St Edmunds and should be appealing not "High" density urban sprawl. "Waiting" to move further on.</p>	<p>Structural landscaping is addressed in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process. This includes the relationship of this development with that being proposed for north east Bury St Edmunds to the north of the railway. Relating the extent of development to the north of Mount Road with that to the south of Mount Road will assist developing a defensible edge to development. Urban development is not synonymous with urban sprawl.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Infrastructure needs attention - for the future and from past misdemeanours	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	No	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Yes, Moreton Hall has expanded over good cropland already, taking up a valuable resource. No further loss of agricultural land should be allowed. Expansion is not a sustainable option.	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes	Do not relocate the football ground	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	AS above do not need to develop further	This is not an option. The area is identified as a strategic growth area in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			yes	Important that the eastern relief road is got on with. This will help reduce traffic at the Sainsbury's roundabout when completed.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no	<p>The preferred option does not contain the quantity of community open space (including community woodland) which was put forward by Woodland Ways and others at public consultations - the amount proposed is disproportionately small.</p> <p>The location of housing up to the eastern boundary of the strategic site conflicts with the use of badger setts within Cherry Trees Wood (centred at TL88746465). Woodland Ways has now (January 2012) started managing the wood. There are two scenarios - either the badgers will leave their setts and this iconic species will be lost from the Moreton Hall area, or any persisting badgers will visit gardens and dig forming a nuisance and generating a campaign for their removal.</p>	These are issues which will need to be addressed through the development of the masterplan for the area.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nicholas Sibbett				<p>The problem can be reduced by situating significant areas of public open space, especially community woodland, adjacent to Cherry Trees Wood so that there is a greater distance between people and badgers.</p> <p>It is noted that developer's options for this site did include sufficient areas of public open space. The open space needs to be brought into the preferred option at a suitable location.</p>		
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	There should be a link road (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development	The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no	PARISH BOUNDARY BUFFER WHERE IS IT? CONTINUED URBAN SPRAWL. PASSES CATTISHALL (IN VIEW) BUILDING LINE HIGH DENSITY BUILD FOR A COUNTRYSIDE BUILD IMPROVEMENTS TO ROADS NOT GOOD ENOUGH.	There is no requirement for a Parish Boundary buffer. Urban development is not synonymous with urban sprawl.	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option (appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path.</p> <p>The school could incorporate sufficient parking to compensate for the inadequate provision at the football facility. The school should use the football facility for some of its outdoor sports activity.</p> <p>The main flight path should be structural amenity space as per the Moreton Hall preferred option.</p> <p>There should be a road link (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Details of the parking provision required for the school will be addressed when the details of the school are being developed. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged.</p> <p>The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	<p>The school should not be placed on the main flight path to the airfield. It should be placed immediately to the south of the football facility in the business park as per the Moreton Hall Developer preferred Option (appendix 6) but avoiding the secondary flight path</p> <p>The school could incorporate sufficient parking to compensate for the inadequate provision at the football facility. The school should use the football facility for some of its outdoor sports activity.</p> <p>The main flight path should be structural amenity space as per the Moreton Hall preferred option.</p> <p>There should be a road link (not just pedestrian and cycle link) from the business park to the South East development</p>	<p>The relocation of the school as suggested would have no impact whatsoever on the land for housing. The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. Details of the parking provision required for the school will be addressed when the details of the school are being developed. Joint use of the football facilities by the school is to be encouraged. The area beneath the safeguarding zones would be used for open space. This could be in the form of school playing fields and structural amenity space. The potential for a road link to the south east development could be explored further.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21672E	Cllr Jim Thorndyke	St Edmundsbury BC		no	This swallows up yet more of Great Barton and Rougham. Is it wise to put retail and school the 'wrong' side of the road that is to be the main link from Mount Road to the Eastern Relief Road, seems to create an additional and unwanted hazard for parents and children. Yet more development next to the railway that is seeing more freight traffic.	Although the proposed development occupies land within parishes, it does not 'swallow' them. The community facilities are centred around and pre-existing community facility. It is the right side of the road for the development proposed.	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	Landscaping area is very weak. Town sprawl into country village parish East Barton / Great Barton Breaks building line of current established Hamlet of Cattishall so looks as if Cattishall is Moreton Hall.	Structural landscaping is addressed in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process. This includes the relationship of this development with that being proposed for north east Bury St Edmunds to the north of the railway. Urban development is not synonymous with urban sprawl.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no	<p>Too much, just far too many houses.</p> <p>You don't address how all these people will get about. You know they will primarily use cars. Your only solution to the problem you know will arise is to say 'we will encourage you all to use the bus or our lovely cycle paths'. This is madness.</p> <p>No convincing case that I have seen anywhere in this document says there is a need for all this growth (other than the social housing element.)</p>	The number of houses proposed has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. It is acknowledged that many people will choose to continue to use their cars and a traffic assessment for the whole town is being prepared as part of these proposals. However, every opportunity must be made to enable people to use alternative forms of transport to move around the town.	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	<p>Land north of Mount Road should be excluded to preserve rural character of existing dwellings and stop the ongoing "ribbon" development of this area towards East Barton / Thurston.</p> <p>Upper School is on the Rougham flight path - land to the south of Airfield Road should be considered for development before this if the flight path is not a restriction.</p> <p>Proposed Upper School site shares a boundary with the existing Public House, which should be avoided if possible.</p> <p>Why is there provision for business development so close to the Suffolk Business Park? Should this not be Retail only?</p> <p>Amenity Space in the wrong place to meet aspirations for shared use alongside football project.</p> <p>Developer Preferred Option makes more sense, particularly if housing development north of Mount Road can be moved to the South of Airfield Road.</p>	<p>There is no requirement or justification for excluding the land to the north of Mount Road.</p> <p>The location of school buildings would be clear of any safeguarding zones. The concept statement identifies an area of open space between the school playing field and the existing public house.</p> <p>Any business element would be small scale to serve the development proposed.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 45: Preferred Option Strategic Site Moreton Hall

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 45a - Strategic Site Moreton Hall - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 45b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred options? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Please respect the 2 properties, in Great Barton on Mount road and adjust boundaries / landscaping	The setting of the two properties will be protected as far as is possible, although it will undoubtedly change.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion	I do not have enough local knowledge to comment on this	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no	Health campus unnecessary (see previous answers)	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers. If it proves not to be required at a later date, then the site can be reappraised. In the meantime, it should be protected from all other forms of development.	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't agree with developing this site at all, for the reasons given earlier.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury				Respect the views of local people about overdevelopment, and coalescence. Do not leave it to developers to come up with their preferred option, which will be the one that maximises their profit with the minimum acceptable level of quality.	The work undertaken by the developers has been developed in full consultation with the local community. The response to this latest consultation has informed the final concept statement prepared by the council. This can now be developed further with the local community through the development of the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society considers the road pattern of the SEBC option to be much preferable.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15809	Mr D C Hatcher			no	We personally are against the proposed new road as we are concerned with the increase in noise and pollution so close to our house which I purchased in a very quiet position. I hope that a large tree belt and cutting in and banking of the road will be guaranteed to minimise this . We can see the benefits to the village as a whole but are still concerned for our position.	These issues will need to be addressed through the masterplan process.	No changes required
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Relief road should link more directly to A14 interchange on west side of railway bridge. Much heavy traffic from Horringer and proposed new hospital will use this. Then you also need good secondary road links to town via Westley Estate as well as cycle and pedestrian access.	The railway forms a barrier to access to the west of the bridge. Road links via the Westley estate are not an option, but foot and cycle links are essential. These are addressed in the concept statement.	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			no	<p>The Developer Options 1 and 2 are unacceptable by virtue of the encroachment on the village. There is little to be preferred between the Developer Preferred Option and SEBC Preferred Option, apart from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction at the south end of the West Bury relief road; • The lack of road closure within Westley for the former option. <p>Both of those issues are covered later in this section.</p> <p>We have already explained (answer to Question 36) why we feel that the selection of this site for a reserved space for a Health Campus is wrong for a number of reasons and is, in fact, an opportunity lost to support other Vision 2031 Themes.</p>	<p>The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy. All other issues are addressed in the core strategy and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>The combination of this reserved site, plus some 450 homes, takes up so much of the available land on this site that essentially any buffer zone is notional; and effectively Westley is absorbed into West Bury St Edmunds. It is difficult to see how Westley would be tangibly different from a housing estate within Bury looking across playing fields.</p> <p>We also feel strongly that West of Bury needs its own Nowton Park equivalent and not just limited provision for sports. We note that substantial green space is being proposed for the Fornham area but, given that the A14 is a barrier to anything other than car traffic, it is all but inaccessible from the South.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>We propose that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development is limited to the 450 homes; • there should be a review of the decision allegedly made concerning the location of the Health Campus with a view to finding a larger and more appropriate location which meets the broader needs of Vision 2031; • the balance of the space should become West Bury Park, with a green corridor through to allow onward safe cycle routes to Little Saxham, Barrow etc; • The land comprising Hall Farm, together with the Underwood Land to the west of the relief road should become part of the public green space after a robust buffer zone for Westley has been provided. 	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relief road should be completed as a condition of any development and referred to as the West Bury relief road. The weight restriction on the railway bridge currently pushes heavy traffic elsewhere and much of this will transit closer to Bury St Edmunds. Thus, this new road is as much a relief road for the rest of West Bury, and will contribute to reducing the traffic closer to town. • We do not see the need for the relief road to join the existing off-set junction at the south and think there should be further consultation on this issue, possibly locating the new junction further to the East. Also the SEBC option involves a diagonal link which involves more asphalt and leaves a bisected field. 	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>The plan also indicates road closures for Westley, which will be necessary, at least at one end of the village. This will have to be resolved later in discussion with local farmers since they have heavy vehicles coming/going at crop periods. We will be happy to participate in discussions at the appropriate time.</p> <p>We have included our own initial thoughts on what a buffer zone should look like. This is provided here for discussion purposes, and should not be seen as prejudicing our strongly held views above. (See following pages under 'Appendix 7').</p> <p>Also, we would see these aspects as being further developed within a Neighbourhood Plan which we would formally ask SEBC to support. We would like to explore whether the Community Infrastructure Levy could be a source to fund the cost of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson				<p>We feel it is reasonable for SEBC to regard this area as a priority in supporting Neighbourhood Planning across the Borough.</p> <p>Recommendation 4: That, before any local plan is approved, the SEBC preferred option for development to the West of Bury St Edmunds is modified to incorporate an appropriate buffer to prevent the coalescence of Westley Village as required by Council policies. The buffer zone should take account of the recommendations from the Parish Council in regard to extent and materials.</p> <p>Recommendation 5: That, before any local plan is approved, SEBC should make clear to developers that any submission which does not incorporate the provision of a relief road to the West of any new development will not be considered.</p>	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15943	Tina Bedford			no	The proposal is unacceptable. It will encroach on Westley village, the buffer zone is too small and our village will no longer retain its 'village identity'. The proposed development of Health Campus should be relocated to Suffolk Business Park Site and the land should be used for recreational purposes. During the week of 23-29 April we had lots of rain, causing Westley Road to flood yet again. Creating a development with lots of concrete and roads will cause more run off unless adequate drainage/storage facilities for excess water is incorporated. At a time when there is a water shortage and hose pipe bans are in place some consideration should be given to these problems should the development proceed.	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy. Any new development will require sustainable drainage, which will avoid the problems feared. Anglian Water confirms that there is no issue with water supply.	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Too large - already developed enough.	The principle of development of the scale proposed is confirmed in Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy, adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR15966	Mr J B Brennan			no	The proposed relief road would only add to the existing traffic congestion. ALL of the Hospital traffic, plus the additional traffic from 450 new houses would make Newmarket Road unmanageable in the rush hour traffic. I understand that the traffic survey that was conducted did NOT take into account the traffic on Newmarket Road during the peak times.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no	See attached PDF	Noted	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15968	Mrs I M Brennan			no	<p>Newmarket Road (which is not wide enough now) is already incapable of taking normal traffic at peak times. We are already unable to exit Oliver Road onto Newmarket Road and I have already sent a request for traffic lights. The proposed road is too near Oliver Road. Why can't there be a slip road off A14 if this development has to take place (which no-one here seems to want though no notice is being taken). With the proposed through traffic on Newmarket Road and Westley Road, we (in Paddock Close) would be unable to tavel easily, being constricted by 2 roads overburdened with traffic. It is bad enough now at school start and finish times as any bus driver will tell you. The traffic survey should be at PEAK TIMES and more consideration given to those people in Oliver Road whose properties will be affected by the proximity of the proposed new road and development. NEWMARKET ROAD NOR WESTLEY ROAD CANNOT COPE NOW NEVER MIND IN THE FUTURE!!!</p>	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLP	Waitrose Ltd		<p>Chapter 16 sets out the guiding principles for the future development of the Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p>Waitrose supports the development of the Strategic Growth Areas in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS11. However, any convenience goods development should be of an appropriate scale to support the needs of the Growth Areas and the proposed Local/Neighbourhood Centres, but not of a scale whereby it could compete with the Town Centre.</p> <p>Chapter 16 should therefore clarify that a retail Assessment will be required in accordance with the NPPF (paragraphs 24 and 26) and the 'Town Centre first' approach.</p>	Any retail element should be of a scale appropriate to serve the needs of the local community consistent with the concept of a walkable community. This is referred to in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15974	Jilly Jackson			no	See my responses above	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15977	Jane Watson			no	<p>Leave the field as it is. If the development must go ahead:- Move the hospital to opposite side of the roundabout off Tut Hill (using the road to the Crematorium) keeping traffic out of town and chocking up Newmarket Road. No access off Newmarket Road to the new development, strengthen the railway bridge on Fornham Lane and use this as the main access for residents and bus routes. No bus links or other access from Oliver Road to the new development. Low density housing across the whole of the development. Only bungalows to be built close to Oliver Road to offer as much privacy as possible to the residents of Oliver Road ,who enjoy the unbroken views which, for many, is one of the main totally separate from Westley Estate reason for choosing to live here. Development to be part of the village and not a 'add on' to the estate.</p>	<p>The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Jane Watson				To afford a house on this development a wage of £50k would be required thus pricing themselves out of the housing market as this a extremely high wage for Bury St Edmunds. I objected to the last proposed development both on line and to the developers and I expect for those comments to be included in this consultation, I do not want to live on a traffic island!	See above	No changes required
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			yes	Hospital only	This support is welcomed, although the housing element is equally important.	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	Recommendation: There is of necessity the need for a suitable buffer for the village of Westley. This is required for consistency and delivers according to Core Strategy.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15987	Jill O'Kelly				<p>I live in Horringer and am very concerned about the plans for Westley. Firstly, the ring road round Westley village will have an adverse affect on the traffic through the village, particularly Westley Lane which is a B road. At the moment the only thing stopping very heavy vehicles from driving through Westley Lane is the weight restriction on the Westley railway bridge. Once the ring road is built this will once again send heavy lorries through the village.</p> <p>Secondly, the siting of a new hospital in Westley would be a disaster for Westley village, having a major impact on residents. A hospital is a 24 hours operation with constant traffic and noise, not suitable for a village. The impact on Horringer would also be massive. We are bound a become a rat run through to the hospital both along Westley Lane and Sharpes Lane, as visitors, staff and patients will want to avoid the town. The A143 is already a busy road with a constant flow of lorries and cars and this would increase what is already a dangerous road.</p>	The need for this development is already established. Other issues are addressed by the concept statement and will developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
					This is a badly thought out document with no insight into the impact on Westley and Horringer in relation to traffic or quality of life for the residents.	Traffic issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes	Are you allowing the hospital to expand (35 and 36) or are you relocating it. Make your minds up before wasting money doing both!	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy as a long term proposal.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			yes	However, there are other sites for WSH and BSE and what is going to happen to the old WSH site after 2031? And definately, definately NOT option 1 and option 2.	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy as a long term proposal. Appropriate uses for the existing hospital site will be looked at closer to the time of relocation.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16000	Mr P Watson			no	<p>Despite the consultations having taken place, the comments and ideas suggested by residents seemed to have been completely ignored. The ideas promoted by the developers at the meetings seem to bear no resemblance to what they have on the table 2 years later. The consultations were weak as the town centre event at the Arc "did not have the westley plans available as they had not been delivered" and the community centre event was a shambles as the meeting room was hidden away at the back with little to highlight its presence.</p> <p>The full closure of the Westley village road will force more traffic over the single road over the rail bridge before being able to turn across to the new development or beyond as a through route. The existing route had a weight limit but will the 'tree line boulevard' has a similar weight restriction or will it end up having HGVs 24 hours a day.</p> <p>The developers plans talk about 2.5 and 3 storey housing on the new site to match that on the existing estate - where are these 2.5 storey houses o</p>	Traffic issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr P Watson				<p>The increased traffic flow from the new estate, the revised cross town route avoiding Westley Village plus the proposed hospital will only add to the congestion at peak time on the bottle neck that is the Newmarket Road railway bridge. Developers/Suffolk CC should pay for the upgrading of the Westley village railway bridge to keep the main traffic flow off Newmarket Road.</p> <p>The road routes suggested by the plan p78 or the appendix pg 104 bears no resemblance to those outlined at the consultation meeting. All of a sudden the cheapest route via the existing farm gate is now on the table - this was not in any of the plans previously touted for the area. If the Westley village route is closed off and the new development link road is only partial built then the residential route of Oliver Road becomes the default 'rat-run' through to Porringer and beyond for cars and HGVs.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr P Watson				<p>I do hope the plan does live up to the it promise that "In response to comments at the exhibition, the relationship between the existing homes to Oliver Road and the new residential development will be carefully considered (and consulted) to ensure privacy and protection of amenities of the existing residents" I am not a NIMBY - just want to make sure that the plans are not purely profit driven and these developments are sustainable and integrate with the existing community, which is part of your specific remit in the council. Comments from the developers suggest that the first of the houses could be built by 2013 not the 5 plus years referred to in the document. The feedback from the developers to date has been appalling... At every stage I have provided contact details for the reports from the consultation to be provided and despite several reminders nothing came back, ever. If the developers say they are consulting it is very much one way !!! This does not inspire confidence for the future.</p>	See above	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Yes, abandon the plans for development.	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>We do not object in principle to the preferred option for this site, but we would like to make the following brief comments on the option as based upon the presentation in this document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Core Strategy requires community and leisure facilities to be included as part of this development, but it is not clear from this diagram as to where they would be located. We assume that these facilities would be clustered close to the retail and employment centre, but this perhaps ought to be made clear on this diagram. - Whilst it is perhaps too detailed a consideration for this document, the Bury Vision 2031 document might set out a principle that each of the 5 strategic growth sites should be distinctive; a place in its own right, compatible with the character of Bury St Edmunds. 	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council is and will continue to work with the developer and the borough council on the development of this site, in relation to the county council's strategic and service delivery interests, and will make more detailed comments through this process. The details relating to the layout of this site may change as a result of this work.	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, that remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>				See above	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16023	D Munns				<p>As regard to the proposed new hospital site and as stated in my previous correspondence I still feel that this is the wrong choice of site for the hospital camps though I now understand that it is going to be a long way from creation. It would be right close to the exceptionally noisy A14 road and the ever more busy railway line. Just stand in the Asda car park and see the effect when a freight train plunges through.</p> <p>The hospital and hospice presently occupy such a good and convenient location and in my opinion they should remain where they are.</p> <p>Anyhow having got that lots off my chest I have to accept the so called calculated needs of the Preferred Option sites which have now been adopted and in the circumstances I must congratulate yourself and your planning teams and Councillors in your ultimate selection of probably some of the most suitable sites and for ruling out some of the other very wrong sites first proposed.</p> <p>Having therefore given all of the Preferred Option sites my outline</p>	<p>The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy. Traffic issues are addressed in the concept statement and will developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Too many houses	The housing requirements were established during the production of the now	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16034	Sylvia Bartlett				<p>1) Oliver Road is already a very busy through-road. The traffic that will be generated from the hospital/housing development will be a nightmare of chaos/gridlock and will certainly worsen our Oliver Road route. The exit from Oliver Road/the new road once built is too close, imagine the problem of both roads trying to emerge into Newmarket Road. We already have difficulty getting out.</p> <p>2) The hospital/ housing seem crammed into too tight an area. Have you given any thought that the hospital may need more room once it's built? The hospital should definitely have its own entrance and exit, I foresee problems if not.</p> <p>3) The developer speaks of a buffer zone with trees for a wildlife corridor, but it does not really make up for the loss the wildlife will lose from where it's been for years. Could they not consider a specific copse/glade for the wildlife, it would also benefit residents and would greatly enhance the area.</p>	<p>These issues and are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	No	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Yes. ANother 450 hojmes is not a sustainable option. Vaulable cropland would be lost. Small holdings (and their associated homes) would be a sustainable option. Not a good site for a hospital - too far out.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town. Smallholdings may be desirable, but to meet the housing requirements of the borough would consume far more countryside.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21342E	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae		Smiths Gore	no	<p>No, we do not agree with the preferred option for the development of this site and recommend that the boundary is changed to include the Westley Hall Farm land as shown on our enclosed plan Proposal Map Changes Policy BV4: Strategic Site West Bury St Edmunds. Please refer to our answer to Question 7 (BV4).</p> <p>Whilst we support the strategic site option and believe that the Bury West development should be allocated, we disagree with the strategic amenity space and structural landscaping elements of the development. We strongly believe that these should be altered to include the Westley Hall Farm site, and that the land should be considered in conjunction with the development site as a possible further strategic amenity space in order that the area is planned comprehensively.</p>	The proximity of the site to the village of Westley is such, that if it was to be included, it would most likely be protected from development as part of the strategic buffer zone between Westley and Bury St Edmunds. Westley itself is identified in the adopted Core Strategy as countryside, so does not have a housing settlement boundary.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	The Executors of Miss MMP MacRae				The preferred option for the Bury West development indicates that there will be one pedestrian/cycle link between the development site and Westley which is to be located to the south of the site. If the Westley Hall site is considered in conjunction with the strategic development site there would be an opportunity to provide an additional pedestrian/cycle link. This could run centrally through the development site increasing connectivity and linkages, in addition would also meet a key policy objective as outlined in Policy CS11 in the adopted Core Strategy provide improved public transport, foot and cycle links to the town centre.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	AS above do not need to develop further	The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no	as I've said before scrape the plans	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no	We are concerned about several aspects. The extent of the proposed buffer - this needs to be substantial to ensure the non-coalescence that is embedded in the core strategy. It also needs to be carefully planned to be in place well before any building starts so that it provides the buffer from the start not taking years to mature. Similarly the relief road - this should be referred to as the west Bury relief road, as it needs to be built to a standard that will take traffic away from the town centre as well as making adequate provision for the increased traffic arising from the north west and west Bury developments.	Thank you for your comments. The principle of development in this location is agreed in Core Strategy CS 11. Alternative options have been considered and discounted, as set out in appendix 7.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray				<p>It is essential that the relief road is built prior to any housing development and that there is no opportunity for the developer to overturn the clear requirement in the core strategy that the relief road is a mandatory part of any planning permission and that its funding is in place including the developer's contribution. It is essential that, as indicated at information events, the route of the relief road and the position of any closure of the existing road through the village, as well as decisions about the composition of the buffer, needs to be carefully considered during consultation with the parish council and villagers.</p> <p>The selection of this site for the hospital has not been clearly explained. The site, whilst convenient for the town has a number of drawbacks, including its proximity to the railway line and its limitation on design and any future expansion. An explanation is required of why this was the preferred option and a further review conducted of the alternatives.</p>	See above	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no	Despite the consultations having taken place, the comments and ideas suggested by residents seemed to have been completely ignored. The ideas promoted by the developers at the meetings seem to bear no resemblance to what they have on the table 2 years later. The consultations were weak as the town centre event at the Arc "did not have the westley plans available as they had not been delivered" and the community centre event was a shambles as the meeting room was hidden away at the back with little to highlight its presence. The full closure of the Westley village road will force more traffic over the single road over the rail bridge before being able to turn across to the new development or beyond as a through route. The existing route had a weight limit but will the 'tree line boulevard' has a similar weight restriction or will it end up having HGVs 24 hours a day. The developers plans talk about 2.5 and 3 storey housing on the new site to match that on the existing estate - where are these 2.5 storey houses on the Estate.	Thank you for your comments. Traffic issues are addressed in the concept statement and will developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required

Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr P Watson				The increased traffic flow from the new estate, the revised cross town route avoiding Westley Village plus the proposed hospital will only add to the congestion at peak time on the bottle neck that is the Newmarket Road railway bridge. Developers/Suffolk CC should pay for the upgrading of the Westley village railway bridge to keep the main traffic flow off Newmarket Road.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
Responses submitted via email or post March - April 2012	Mr P Watson				<p>The road routes suggested by the plan p78 or the appendix pg 104 bears no resemblance to those outlined at the consultation meeting. All of a sudden the cheapest route via the existing farm gate is now on the table - this was not in any of the plans previously touted for the area. If the Westley village route is closed off and the new development link road is only partial built then the residential route of Oliver Road becomes the default 'rat-run' through to Porringer and beyond for cars and HGVs. I do hope the plan does live up to the it promise that "In response to comments at the exhibition, the relationship between the existing homes to Oliver Road and the new residential development will be carefully considered (and consulted) to ensure privacy and protection of amenities of the existing residents"</p> <p>I am not a NIMBY - just want to make sure that the plans are not purely profit driven and these developments are sustainable and integrate with the existing community</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr P Watson				<p>Comments from the developers suggest that the first of the houses could be built by 2013 not the 5 years referred to in the document.</p> <p>The feedback from the developers to date has been appalling... At every stage I have provided contact details for the reports from the consultation to be provided and despite several reminders nothing came back, ever. If the developers say they are consulting it is very much one way !!! This does not inspire confidence for the future.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	the roads into town cannot cope with the projected traffic PLUS RURAL VISION build at Barrow 179 homes..!	Traffic issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan process. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no	The health campus bridges the already reduced gap between Westley and the town. Why can the health campus not go in the northern section of the South East development?	The proposed site is considered to be the most appropriate location for the long-term growth of the town and provision of a high quality health service within the locality.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 46: Preferred Option Strategic Site West

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 46a - Strategic Site West - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 46b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	Retaining distinctiveness of Westley will be difficult and plans reconsidered.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Westley is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion	I do not have enough local knowledge to comment on this	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no	Living in Cattishall this particular proposal is of key interest and concern to me. I do hope (and indeed, working hard as a group to ensure) that the hamlet will be protected - Cattishall needs to clearly be defined as an individual hamlet firmly in the bosom of Gt Barton village and NOT part of a new development. Concerns are that the rural aspects of Cattishall will disappear and if the development is of a Moreton Hall standard, it would be a tragedy. Developing Gt. Barton village at the heart is a good thing but congestion through the village needs to be suitably addressed and some landscaping needs to be put in place to be at a mature level by the start of the development work.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15739	Judith Shard			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15782	D A Howell			no	I accept that that a need for more housing has been identified. I would rather it were built south of the railway line, a convenient and sensible boundary. If that housing is, regrettably, to be built on the main site identified (A143 / railway line) than it must only be built AFTER the road network has been improved. The minimum required is that the A143 is duelled from the junction with The Avenue to the roundabout at the A134 junction and that a roundabout is constructed at the Avenue junction. The amount of traffic on the A143 makes it very difficult to join that road from the side roads at the moment, particularly during the sugar beet campaign. To add so much extra traffic from the proposed development would add to the already severe problem and create "rat runs" on the roads in the village.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	D A Howell				I strongly object to any new housing being built on what looks like a secondary site in the "vee" between the A143 and The Avenue. The boundary of the housing should be as shown on the main site with the "green belt" land to the NE. This "green belt" should be extended in an arc to encompass Barton Stud and the "vee" proposed infill.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. There is no statutory Green Belt in St Edmundsbury.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson				<p>I do believe there are some positive proposals here. The provision of a relief road will have a positive impact on the village</p> <p>The housing predominantly on the eastern side of the relief road is positive.</p> <p>The hospital is in the wrong place. I am aware that the site is already enshrined in policy, but it would be better for all if it were located on the north side of the A14 towards the crematorium</p> <p>The proposed site has little room to expand if necessary It will have a negative impact on Westley Village i.e. noise, lighting, traffic. I find it difficult to believe you can identify this site now as being appropriate when you are 15 to 20 years away from building it.</p>	<p>These are issues which will need to be addressed through the development of the masterplan for the area. The requirement for a new hospital/health campus has been based upon information provided by the strategic health providers and is confirmed by its inclusion in the adopted Core strategy.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Anderson				<p>The access to the site is poor unless you are going to build a new access road off the A14.</p> <p>Coalescence/Buffer zone</p> <p>Considering Westley has been promised an buffer zone, the indicative representations on this map are a joke..</p> <p>A proper buffer zone needs to be planted now and needs to be circa 200 metres wide around the village</p> <p>There is no proper definition of strategic amenity space, and this area also requires a buffer zone between it and the village</p> <p>The road through Westley needs to be closed off, but only from the north</p> <p>Ignoring Westley Hall Farm cannot be right, it should form part of the buffer zone perhaps, or perhaps another solution may be found, but it should not be ignored.</p> <p>There are no real proposals which gives the west side of Bury improved cycle/walk ways.</p>	See above	See above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15789	Andrew Davies			no	<p>I comment on the proposed development site in N/E Bury Compiegne Way in the Great Barton Parish.</p> <p>The proposed development and siting would adversely impact on the unique village identity of Great Barton. No guaranteed Buffer Zone has been proposed. Additional traffic generated by both this development and those at Ixworth & Stanton would hugely impact on the already congested and insufficient roads network through Great Barton. Due to bottleneck by single lane under railway bridge, more vehicles would choose other routes using minor roads in and around Great Barton.</p> <p>The rural feel and nature of the village would be destroyed.</p> <p>Great Barton would be in danger of just becoming a suburb of Moreton Hall/Bury St Edmunds and not a special and unique village. This is against current Planning Policy.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't agree with developing this site at all, for the reasons given earlier.	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	Great Barton needs a by- pass with a direct link to Junction 44 on A14 The single lane, traffic light controlled, bridge under the railway at Ortwell Roads needs to be enlarged to take two way traffic This development would need to be totally self sufficient and completely independent of Moreton Hall	Policy CS 11 of the Core Strategy addresses the need for a bypass. Any new development would need to integrate suitably with existing development as shown in the concept plan	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Respect the views of local people about overdevelopment, and coalescence. Do not leave it to developers to come up with their preferred option, which will be the one that maximises their profit with the minimum acceptable level of quality.	The Core Strategy Policy CS11 protects against coalescence as do the concept plans.	No changes required
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	Great Barton needs a bypass with a direct link to Rookery Junction on A14. A bypass along the A143 route will only speed traffic into existing problems which will in any event be worsened by the development. The single lane, traffic light controlled, bridge under the railway needs to be enlarged If this cannot be done ten consideration should be given to restoring two way traffic with a restriction on lorries using that route.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		yes	Society supports developer's preferred option which sees shops and school adjacent to an open green alongside A143.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15808	Alison and John Baines			no	<p>We live at Winsford Road and quite often use Orttewell Road to access the A143 north of Bury. The reduction to one lane under the railway bridge results in a bottleneck which at busy times stretches back to the A143 roundabout as we experienced today around 5.30pm.</p> <p>We believe that unless two way traffic can be safely reinstated, further extra housing should not be built on Moreton Hall - and housing for N. E. Bury north of the railway line in the Great Barton direction should not even be contemplated.</p>	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	No changes required
BVR15812	Cattishall Residents c/o Mrs Joanna Meyer	Cattishall Residents	John Popham Planning	no		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	<p>Great Barton needs a bypass with a direct link to Rookery Junction on A14. A bypass along the A143 route will only speed traffic into existing problems which will in any event be worsened by the development.</p> <p>The single lane, traffic light controlled, bridge under the railway needs to be enlarged If this cannot be done ten consideration should be given to restoring two way traffic with a restriction on lorries using that route.</p>	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Planning policy has been breached. STBC need to revisit to ensure that all policy has been correctly applied. As it has not. * Size of development increased for same build size from 44Ha to 66.5HA increase of 26.5Ha Amenity land being used as a divide / buffer Wrong interpretation of Policy CS1 & Protecting Settlement identity. Total disgrace to put this forward * TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE * Requirements of Moreton Hall synergy note listed. * Needs a rapid review before September Final Vision 	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15913	Mrs Kate Trevitt			no	<p>I would recommend that the development does NOT take place and for the following reasons :</p> <p>A development of 1250 houses closely adjacent to a village of just over 900 houses will have a dire effect on Great Barton and, in effect, make us a suburb of BSE. In the BC's Vision documents there are promises that village integrity and identity will be maintained but so far no one has suggested anything that would give us hope that this will come to fruition. I do appreciate that it is early days and we cannot expect to know where each tree is going but at the moment we live in dread of this development. It is especially worrying that we can gain no assurance that in years to come development will not sneak behind Cattishall and towards the Church. Again, I do appreciate that nothing is set in stone : nearly 30 years ago my husband and I had the assurance - from the Planning Office! - that development would never take place on 'our side of the railway line'.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Kate Trevitt				<p>A development of 1250 houses will produce, at a conservative estimate, 2000 cars accessing, via two junctions, on to the A143. Add to this the fact that not insubstantial developments will be taking place in Ixworth and Stanton. And add to that the fact that the A143 is seriously under pressure, both from cars and ever increasingly large lorries. At various meetings John Kelly of Berkeley Homes, when asked about the transport issues, has burred on about cycle paths and buses - no mention of cars. Both Berkeley Homes and the B. Council HAVE to factor into their plans and calculations the fact that the car is a very important part of all our lives and it will not go away. Homes have to have adequate parking and roads need to be suitable for the volume of cars using them. In this particular case cars on the A143 have to cope with the bottleneck at the railway bridge. This is bad enough now but what will it be like after another 2000+ cars are impacting upon it?</p>	<p>A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Kate Trevitt				In your Rural Vision document you mention the possibility of a bypass off Compiegne Way : a bypass at this location will in no way improve the lot of GB and the traffic through The Street. For a bypass to be of any use it needs to be beyond the Bunbury Arms, towards Ixworth, to prevent HGV traffic from even entering the Village. I appreciate that this will probably be one of the more expensive routes but it should be marked on a map NOW, so that, when it can be afforded, the land is already set aside for it. I have just noted the following statement : 'The new development will help deliver a range of improvements to address existing traffic-related problems beyond the site' - what a wonderful example of 'developer-speak', backed up by absolutely nothing concrete.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Kate Trevitt				A development of 1250 houses will add great strain to both water and sewage demands and our concerns have not been allayed at any meetings. At one, a gentleman from Berkeley Homes, when asked about the water shortage, said that GB residents would just have to use less, so that the 1250 homes would be all right. One hopes he was being flippant but When the comparatively small development of 58 houses took place in The Coppice, it impacted horribly on Nacton Lane : on more than one occasion raw sewage made its appearance. The implication is that a new sewage plant may be required to service this development of 1250 houses - any plans for this? We are, as you know, under a hose pipe ban at the moment - how is the BC going to meet the requirements of another 1250 homes? There has been no mention that I could find in either of your Vision Documents that these two issues need to be solved.	See above	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Kate Trevitt				<p>In conclusion, GB residents, including myself, are not against development per se but it does need to be planned for properly. As you know, GB Parish Council has, after careful consideration of many issues, suggested a development of 100 houses + amenities on School Road but with this Berkeley development one gets the impression that the thinking has been : here's a chunk of land, let's put 1250 houses on it.</p> <p>For the reasons above, this is neither a practical nor suitable location for a development of 1250 houses.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15917	Chris Lale			yes		The support is welcomed	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Bypass required.	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		yes	<p>Berkeley is the developer for this strategic site. We support the preferred option in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The ' hub' approach to a new primary school and local centre. 2. The close proximity of the local centre to the A143. 3.The retention of the existing bridleway as a key 'green route' as well as other existing features of the landscape such as the Severals Clump woodland. 4. The new green route to Moreton Hall via the existing opening to the mainline railway embankment. 5. A non-built, landscaped area providing separation between the development scheme and Cattishall. 6. The strategic gap between the development and Great Barton. 7. Two points of access onto the A143 which are joined to provide for a circular bus service. 8. A landscaped buffer to the A143. 9. New planting that links with the existing to provide new wildlife corridors and ecological enhancement. 	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>10.Its application of established principles of sound urban design:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mixed use, sustainable amenities. b. Walkable neighbourhoods. c. Designing in context. <p>We note that the Developer Preferred Option is also endorsed in the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the draft Area Action Plan.</p> <p>In relation to the 'country park' suggested in the preferred option we have made comments on this in relation to Question 42 above. We note the aspirations within the Green Infrastructure Strategy but would emphasise the importance of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The aspirations being flexible and responsive to community engagement and the masterplanning process. 2.Certainty as to how these aspirations may impact on land use budgets. 		No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd			<p>As per our answer to Question 8 above, the masterplanning proposal for this strategic site will be subject to public engagement this year ahead of and in parallel with the next draft Action Plan consultation.</p> <p>Should the masterplanning consultation recommend adjustments to the preferred concept we will make representations on this in the consultation on the next drafts of the Action Plan and would therefore wish to reserve our position in this regard.</p>		
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no	Bypass required.	A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15944	Eric Chapman			no	No construction should be started on this site until the A143 Great Barton bypass has been completed. If this is not done, the existing peak-time congestion will become dramatically worse ensuring long delays and cause dangerous diversions onto other unsuitable minor rural roads.	Thank you for your comments. Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding .	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding .	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			no	<input type="checkbox"/> The increase in this land grab by both developer and St Edmunds council has made this site proposal untenable. <input type="checkbox"/> Cattishall residents have employed the services of a planning consultant and have met with both developer and council in an effort to agree landscaping around the site. The developer was not at any stage prepared to negotiate any such buffer zone.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			no	<p>The increase in this land grab by both developer and St Edmunds council has made this site proposal untenable.</p> <p>Cattishall residents have employed the services of a planning consultant and have met with both developer and council in an effort to agree landscaping around the site. The developer was not at any stage prepared to negotiate any such buffer zone.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	Great Barton needs a bypass with a direct link to Rookery Junction on A14. A bypass along the A143 route will only speed traffic into existing problems which will in any event be worsened by the development. The single lane, traffic light controlled, bridge under the railway needs to be enlarged If this cannot be done, consideration should be given to restoring two way traffic with a restriction on lorries using that route.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	We do not agree with the open access/country park. This would necessarily involve amenities (toilets, visitor centre, cafe etc). It is not a true buffer zone for Great Barton which will benefit more from the existing farmland rather than creeping urbanisation.	A country park can create an effective buffer as well as provide significant amenity benefit for the community.	No changes required
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	I would like to see the number of proposed new houses reduced. Also a much stronger and larger buffer is required to segregate the hamlet of Cattishall/Great Barton from the proposed development. The hamlet of Cattishall and Great Barton must remain rural and to achieve this more space is required between them and the proposed new development.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd		See 44	Any retail element should be of a scale appropriate to serve the needs of the local community consistent with the concept of a walkable community. This is referred to in the concept	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no	If development has to happen, go back to your original plan SS48!	SS48 was a proposal submitted to the council for consideration, it was not a council proposal.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	<p>Recommendation: The identity of Cattishall has been covered under Qu8. The Open Access land preference as the buffer to the north of the proposed development must be delivered in perpetuity and the management defined for consultation. The area between the A143 and The Avenue has been under continuous permanent pasture with mature oaks. This landscape characterises the historical entrance to Great Barton and should attain the status of protection. The definition of facilitates the provision of an A143 Gt Barton Bypass needs to be qualified at the next consultation stage. The instigated transport and traffic management survey of the increased vehicles on the A143 to the A14 needs to be available for consultation at the next stage.</p>	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	That this site is even being considered means that any response will be ignored. Cattishall will not be 'protected' by a few spindly shrubs and minimal 'amenity open space.' This is cover for cheap and ineffective mitigation measures.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves				Under BSEV31, Q47, we have major reservations concerning both the impact and location of the current preferred option for development between the A143, the railway line and Cattishall. We support the thesis within Policy CS11 that the identity and segregation of Great Barton should be maintained, but the plans as currently proposed do not incorporate a sufficiently defined, clear, physical, geographical and visual buffer zone between the creeping development of the borough north of the railway line and the quite separate community of Great Barton. We identify with and support the concerns being expressed both by Great Barton Parish Council and Cattishall residents - and we are prepared to further contribute to the debate required to resolve these issues.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves				<p>In particular, CS11 states facilitating the provision of an A143 Great Barton Bypass as an aim. We are aware that the issue of a Great Barton Bypass has been live for around 30 years - and yet it remains well down SCC's list of highway priorities. A southern Bypass route, taken with the constraints that already exist in traversing the railway line will only compound an already difficult and unsustainable situation. The A143 through Great Barton carries primarily through traffic - not just locally generated movement from the village. Actually, it serves all communities and towns to the north and northeast.</p> <p>It is our view that a Bypass for Great Barton will become a viable possibility only if it can be demonstrated that the infrastructure works will together serve and benefit a number of communities, with structural and economic advantage at regional level.</p> <p>Ingham is another community on the SCC list - and suffers as Great Barton does from high volume traffic, particularly HGVs.</p>	<p>Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves				<p>A northern Bypass route, departing to the west from a point on the A143 south of Ixworth and in the general area of Great Queach and Highfields Farm and traversing high level open agricultural ground to intersect either with the western curve of Barton Bottom or the roundabout at the northern end of the Fornham Bypass dual carriageway, would achieve overall relief for the whole area. HGV routing restrictions based on axle weights and access could be applied to the communities of Ingham and Great Barton at the same time.</p> <p>A further consideration should be that most of the ground involved with a southern route is low lying and waterlogged - and would demand the upgrading - or the creation of an all new adequate railway line crossing. Thus, the additional civil engineering and drainage involved, plus the high capital cost of railway related infrastructure makes this option extremely doubtful.</p>	This development will not deliver a bypass for Great Barton. However, the development of the site must not prejudice the delivery of a bypass in the future. This is addressed in the concept statement.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding.	No changes required
BVR16001	Terence and Cherry Woottan			no	Don't do it before infrastructure and other provisions are in place.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no	Curb the number of houses - these along with proposed number of houses to be built on Moreton Hall will only add to traffic congestion when a major part of plan is to reduce traffic.	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Yes, abandon the plans for development.	No explanation is given to support this	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>We do not object in principle to the preferred option for this site, but we would like to make the following brief comments on the option as based upon the presentation in this document. The details relating to the layout of this site may change as a result of this work.</p> <p>The Core Strategy requires community and leisure facilities to be included as part of this development, but it is not clear from this diagram as to where they would be located. We assume that these facilities would be clustered close to the retail and employment centre, but this perhaps ought to be made clear on this diagram.</p> <p>Whilst it is perhaps too detailed a consideration for this document, the Bury Vision 2031 document might set out a principle that each of the 5 strategic growth sites should be distinctive; a place in its own right, compatible with the character of Bury St Edmunds.</p>	These issues are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, that remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>					No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			no	<p>Planning Policy has been Breach / Broken</p> <p>The Site BV5 (66.5 Ha) is a very late amendment & should not be considered due to its increase of Size over SS48 of 40Ha the previous land allocation in 2011. It represents a 60% increase in land mass grab. It should be returned to the "agreed" & consulted on SS48 (40Ha) of 2011. NOT BV5 of 66Ha</p> <p>As of the very late introduction of BV5, it is not had the true reflection of what is required in size of development demands and needs. Where the previous site allocation SS48 of 40Ha dictated to be acceptable by STBC. Where is the justification of the Extra land for development please?</p> <p>It is just "blatant" land grab for additional future housing over and above "minimum" / 1250 mentioned in different formats & consultations prior to 2012. BV5 exceeds the land required to meet the purpose by another 26.5 Ha and should return to 40Ha site alloc Hon SS48 for development.</p>	<p>The principle of locating strategic growth to the north east of Bury St Edmunds was established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>It (BV5) needs to go back a FULL step for full legal consultation.</p> <p>The Strategic Amenity land "Allocation" should be NOT be used as a buffer to divide Town & Country It will act as a spring board further future growth into the "under belly" of Gt Barton towards Holy Innocents Church & East Barton. (Future Option of 600 Acres as previously mentioned) BV5 has a very direct impact on the Hamlet of Cattishall and the village of Gt Barton as it joins Town & Country. Amenity Land is not a divide / buffer and should no have been put in as such. It is a blatant breach of planning law & in favour of the developer.</p> <p>This Preferred Developers (Berkley) Option, Renegades against the developers previous public statements as in the reply to Policy 6 Compiegne Way IA143 and STBC Reply (Below).</p> <p>On all Berkeley literature "Growth was from the railway towards A143. Why and how has it turned a full 90degrees east and been allowed to engulf Cattishall. (January 2012(Draft) It should return to "original" site plan of 2010/11 5548.</p>	<p>The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. Prior to the identification of this site, there were two site submitted to the council for consideration, SS48 and WS65. Neither site was being proposed by the council. SS48 was smaller than that now proposed, but WS65 was significantly larger. The scale of development has been established by the adopted Core Strategy. Other matters are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.</p>	<p>Address issues through the masterplan process</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>This is now clearly NOT the case and was totally misleading residents of Cattishall ,Great Barton and Moreton Hall with no re course of accountability or justification for the additional land allocation</p> <p>The hamlet of Cattishall has NOT been adequately protected through the provision of the correct type of "Buffer I Divide to maintain its century's old individuality and now represents an a excellent opportunity to re instate what was once there in line with the Policy CS3</p> <p>Design & Impact This land no way leans towards a softened naturalistic edge that maintains the identity and segregation of Great Barton</p> <p>Not consistent with other Previous /Local Planning Policies</p> <p>Lacks comprehensive tree screen planting to both boundaries</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>The requirements of residents present & future has been inadequately addressed and needs to be re visited with more legality towards LDF & Core Strategy and away from the land option controlled by the developer's demands and needs.</p> <p>This development is in an unacceptable format and requires a more detailed planning / drafting before the final vision in September 2012 as what is not changed for the better now will unfortunately become irreversible at a later date.</p> <p>Example of this unfortunately what has been done to date has been poor in awareness such as the naming of the development. Compeigne Way, Development North West of Bury St Edmunds It is Great Barton and always has been. Add this with continuing moving building no red line policy.</p> <p>3) The boundary's (North-east BSE) totally encapsulates Cattishall.</p> <p>4) The Development stops at the hedge / Green Lane "D" road. This is a line of convenience and not that of need. As the land provided in SS48 handled / gave provision for same density of housing etc.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>5) Why the extra need for development land??</p> <p>6) This is the wish of Landowner /developer / STBC and has NO not respect & adherence to LDF Policy CS I.Policy CS 1 -St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (iv)</p> <p>7) This is town connecting with village hamlet and positively promotes urban sprawl. Which is against all policies.</p> <p>8) The boundaries should be returned to SS48 of 40HaThis accounted for the same size of development that is still being planned / promoted for but now with an EXTRA</p> <p>26.S Ha No Water tight justification is forth coming and can only concluded a behind closed doors "done deal" has been done with the Land Controller / Developer (Berkley) and STBC. It has come to our attention that the developer (Berkley) has an future option on 600 acres of Prairie type farm land beyond Cattishall into Great Barton which is wholly unacceptable, but acceptable business practice to STBC!</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>9) There needs to be a rapid rethink on land allocation prior to September 2012 FINAL VISION Changes, should be made so that the development BVS (66.SHa) should be returned to SS48 of40HaThis is what the developer & SEBC originally proposed within the feasibility study on containing all that was / is required within the LDF / CS 12S0</p> <p>10) There needs to be a major rethink on the infrastructure A by pass is years away (currently number IS on the national table of By Pass importance) although a . provision has been "pencilled" in it bears no foundation to future possibility of a bypass what so ever as there is no "other end" so it can not truly By Pass Great Barton. It has just ticked the Box for planning law.</p> <p>11) There has been no consideration to the increase in traffic flow / density on the A 143 As a result of the Rural Vision some 300 houses built along the A143.</p>		No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>12) As the Developers Traffic Survey has not been published in time for this consultation Therefore all facts are not available to give a just & balance decision.</p> <p>13) In 2006 Option 6 comments shows a number of people replied and even then objected to the previous SS48 development. With Traffic density being a MAJOR CONCERN notable person(s) were Cllr David Chappell & Cllr Jim Thorndyke who objected and STBC reply was</p> <p>This preferred option (BV5) does not respect the character of the existing communities of Cattishall especially that of Cattishall Farm House as the development infringes / adjoins directly onto this property with no respect of its historic value (Circa 1635).It pushes up to the front drives Cattishall residents with only a hedge & D road as a divide. This way the boundary (Town & Country) is engulfing the properties and the middle of Cattishall into the development. With NO divide of respect of planning.</p>		No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Lamplough				<p>There is very little or no synergy between Moreton Hall and NE fobs Development.</p> <p>As mentioned by STBC. Stronger Landscaping along Railway is the best from both developers There has to be a statuary 75meter demanded from Network Rail. Full Stop.</p> <p>Secondary structural landscaping is unacceptable as a divide / buffer. It is categorically not wide enough. It should be in excess of "buffers that have gone before such as on Moreton Hall (Natterers Wood). An open gap would be maintained between the northern edge of the development & Gt Barton in order to protect the separation of the village & Bury St Edmunds. Part of this gap would be laid out as formal & informal open space to provide a high quality landscaped buffer between the development & the village.IE Country Park as per Preferred Option.</p>		

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Too many houses	The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement is valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR16035	John Roe			no	Review the validity of this proposed development.	The plan is valid, there is no need for review	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Yes. The proposed 1250 homes is not a sustainable option; it is simply the expansionist development strategy of the past. We need a sustainable future. Small holdings (and their associated homes) would be a sustainable option.	This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town. Smallholdings may be desirable, but to meet the housing requirements of the borough would consume far more countryside.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	AS above do not need to develop further	The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement is valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes	BUT the A143 is already very difficult to access at peak times due to traffic flow. More traffic, more problems.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21528E	Sarah Papworth	Imperial College London		no	<p>Development should not take place on this site. There is insufficient access, so development will increase bottlenecks. Most importantly however, this area is currently countryside.</p> <p>The husband of the local councillor for this area is the individual selling this land. The local councillor has therefore declared a conflict of interests and will not support local residents. A alternate councillor should be assigned to local residents to support their views in relation to these developments. It is not sufficient that their local councillor withdraw from the issue. Care should be taken that malfeasance of public office does not occur.</p>	<p>Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. This plan is intended to meet the needs of a growing town and cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites alone. Buffer zones, wildlife and access are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.</p>	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21531E	Alice Mayer			no	Cattishall and its surrounding countryside will be affected by this proposed development as it stands. The boundary for the proposed development is far too close to rural and agricultural areas. Cattishall and the beautiful countryside that surround other parts of Bury absolutely should not be affected by developments.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21554E	David Mewes			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no	Great Barton should have a bypass linked directly to Rookery Crossroads.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	Gt Barton needs a Bypass with direct link to Rookery junction on A14	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough			no opinion	THE DEVELOPMENT TAKES CATTISHALL WITHIN IT. AGAINST CS1 LAW. SHOULD BE NOT AMENITY LAND DOUBLING AS A BUFFER. AGAINST PLANNING POLICY'S NO A143 IMPROVEMENT FOR AT LEAST 2500+ TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS A DAY. SO WITH RURAL VISION BUILD ALONG A143 A MINIMUM OF 3400 ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC MOVEMENT PER DAY PLUS THE NEW SCHOOL RUN ADDING CIRCA 400 VEHICLE MOVEMENTS DURING TERM THE ONLY DEVELOPMENT NOT TO HAVE ANY ROADS ADDED TO HELP WITH PROJECTED CONGESTION BY PASS WILL NEVER HAPPEN GT BARTON CURRENTLY NO 15 ON NATIONAL WAITING LIST.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	Great Barton needs a bypass with a direct link to Rookery Junction on A14. A bypass along the A143 route will only speed traffic into existing problems which will in any event be worsened by the development. The single lane, traffic light controlled, bridge under the railway needs to be enlarged. If this cannot be done then restore two way traffic with a restriction on lorries using that route.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	A link road needs to be built with the Rookery junction. The bridge on Orttewell Road needs widening and made two-way.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21663E	Mr Richard Miller						No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis						No changes required
BVR21672E	Cllr Jim Thorndyke	St Edmundsbury BC		no	This proposed site in Great Barton parish seems to be ill thought out and with the offsite infrastructure unsustainable. It uses the A143 which is already overcrowded at peak times and to think of another 1,00 plus homes feeding into the existing road system is unthinkable. The by pass is only to do half a job and the biggest headache (the Thurston junction) was not included at the consultation so all that will be achieved will be to move the queue of traffic from one road to another. To liken it to a village is strange, it will resemble an extension of a very urban Moreton Hall. This is a potential disaster for traffic from Great Yarmouth and closer that have to use the A143.	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21686E	Chloe Stuart			yes	I would strongly recommend that Cattishall and its surrounding countryside be protected from development.	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21695E	Candyace Stuart			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21721E	nick hardaker			yes	Cattishall and its surrounding countryside is protected from any development	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			yes	Where is the Village divide as per CS1 etc. Amenity land is not a divide / buffer, it is a sprawl of the development into Cattishall. Wrongful planning. Needs to be revisited and changed before FINAL VISION Why is there no Road improvements to A143 / Otterwill Bridge where all other developments sites have a relief road (Still not adequate even then)	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21732E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row					No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			yes	This seems like an isolated community as the railway line makes links with the town difficult.	Pedestrian and cycle links are proposed as part of this proposal. This is addressed further in the concept statement and shall be addressed in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no		No explanation is given to support this	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21699E	Humphrey Mayer						No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no	<p>Improvements required to road infrastructure before any development takes place. Proposed buffer zone should extend south to protect the hamlet of Cattishall and north of the A143 to create a "green corridor" either side of the A143 and completely separate Great Barton. Buffer zone should have similar protected status to other proposed and existing public open space, such as Nowton Park, Hardwick Heath etc, i.e. it can never be built upon for housing.</p> <p>Retail / business centre should be retail only.</p> <p>Land immediately to the south of Cattishall Farm to be a green link (possibly woodland) with pedestrian / cycle access only to connect through to the level crossing. Promise that no vehicle link will be established between the new development and Cattishall hamlet to preserve separation, either through the extension of Green Lane across the proposed buffer zone or to the south of Cattishall hamlet as described above.</p>	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Cattishall is a requirement of the development of this area. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eddie Gibson				<p>Orttewell Road rail bridge and roundabout junction with A143 to be included in the development area.</p> <p>The phrase "facilitates the provision of a Great Barton bypass" is almost irrelevant as the preferred location (or even suggested locations) for this is not considered within this plan. What does this actually mean in the context of this development area? The creation of an access point at the northern edge of the development area to facilitate a southern bypass for Great Barton - the least supported route by village residents who prefer a northern or eastern bypass route connecting to the A134 or A14, rather than simply an A143 rat-run which would do nothing to solve the strategic traffic problems at key A143 junctions (Orttewell Road, Mill Road, Thurston Road).</p>	Infrastructure requirements are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 47: Preferred Options Strategic Site North-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 47a - Strategic Site North east - Do you agree with the preferred	Question 47b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	The Open Access land preference as the buffer to the north of the proposed development must be delivered in perpetuity and the management defined for consultation. The area between A143 and the Avenue requires preservation as it is an historic entrance to Great Barton. The transport survey requires examination at the next stage to provide a fully consultative process.	The details of the separation area shall be addressed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15683	Richard Ballam			no	Reduce number of units. Improve link road from A14 (would need duelling). Ensure land adjacent to River Lark is open space to link to existing spaces which go right to the heart of the town centre in Abbey Gardens. This unique feature should be very highly valued. As existing junction to A14 is already congested a new link under A14 to Moreton Hall would be needed. Reroute any new road link to Sudbury away from River Lark.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. The riverside walk is included in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15719	Mrs Andrea Holmes			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15787	Christopher Anderson			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15793	Paul Rowntree	Abbeyfield		no	I don't agree with developing this site at all, for the reasons given earlier.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			no	<p>The road from the Rougham roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a true relief road not a speed restricted high street. The local roads should be independent of the relief road</p> <p>The relief road also needs to link to junction 44 on the A14.</p> <p>If these improvements are not provided there will be complete grid lock at Sainsbury's A14 interchange</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15802	John Corrie & Philip Gadbury			no	Please see question 9 for a detailed answer. Respect the views of local people about overdevelopment, and coalescence. Do not leave it to developers to come up with their preferred option, which will be the one that maximises their profit with the minimum acceptable level of quality.	Thank you for responding. Your comments have been addressed in relation to question 9.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15804	Douglas Frost	Moreton Hall Residents Association		no	<p>The road from the Rougham Road roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities, not a speed restricted high street.</p> <p>The relief road also needs to link to the Rookery junction on the A14.</p> <p>If these improvements are not provided there will be complete grid lock at Bury East A14 interchange affecting traffic from Sainsbury's to Cullum Road as well as on the A14.</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		no	Society prefers layout as proposed for developer's option 3.	Thank you for your comments. This is the preferred option for the reasons set out in the document.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15877	Michael K Bacon	Moreton Hall Residents' Association		no	<p>The road from the Rougham Road roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities, not a speed restricted high street.</p> <p>The relief road also needs to link to the Rookery junction on the A14.</p> <p>If these improvements are not provided there will be complete grid lock at Bury East A14 interchange affecting traffic from Sainsbury's to Cullum Road as well as on the A14.</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15881	Neil Osborn	DLP Panning Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Plc	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15901	Diane Lamplough			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15914	The Hon James Broughton	Barton Stud		yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15917	Chris Lale			no	Relief road cannot be routed through retail centres! Traffic will be too heavy. Might be better routed to east and south east periphery of the site thus also avoiding residential areas.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15925	John Dean	Sustrans ranger/Rougham Control Tower Volunteer		no	Can you guarantee free of traffic bottlenecks?	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. There can be no such guarantee.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15935	Richard Russell				4) <input type="checkbox"/> Specifically relating to the proposed new housing areas in the north west and south east. These are shown as coming too close to the A14, and one can see now what a miserable living environment this provides alongside the A14 in Stowmarket. Future generations will surely be aghast that this proximity was ever allowed whilst leading to such levels of pollution in people's houses and gardens.	The bulk of the development area is situated at some distance from the A14. At its closest point, development would be considerably further from the A14 than that referred to in Stowmarket, with landscape buffers as detailed in the concept statement.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15937	John Kelly	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15940	Joan Dean			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15945	Mr and Mrs M Dubroff			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15947	David Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15950	Elsa Finch			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15954	Dawn Parnell			no	A reservoir to conserve our rainfall. No mass housing or development.	Thank you for your comment. The proposed development is considered to be the most attainable form of sustainable development for the long-term benefit of the town.	No changes required
BVR15955	Mr C Narrainen			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15959	Mark Manning			no	<p>The road from the Rougham Road roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities, not a speed restricted high street.</p> <p>The relief road also needs to link to the Rookery junction on the A14 although this will do little to relieve congestion in this area. In fact it may well simply move the congestion from one area to another. It is not the answer.</p> <p>If these improvements are not provided there will be complete grid lock at Bury East A14 interchange affecting traffic from Sainsbury's to Cullum Road as well as on the A14.</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15961	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes ltd			See attached statement (PDF)		No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15963	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup			no	Too large - no major roads on boundaries - these roads are already heavily congested.	These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15967	Victoria Bullock	Barton Willmore LLP	Bellway Homes Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15969	Mrs A Howcutt			no	No. of proposed new houses reduced.	The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and the associated housing requirement is valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR15970	David Nettleton			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd		See 44	Any retail element should be of a scale appropriate to serve the needs of the local community consistent with the concept of a walkable community. This is referred to in the concept statement and will need to be developed further in the masterplan process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15978	Mr Hugh Howcutt			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	no	<p>Recommendations: The commissioned traffic and transport survey needs to be available for consultation at the next stage especially the impact at the Sicklesmere and Sainsbury roundabouts and the later with the A14.</p> <p>The buffer between Rushbrooke and Rougham hamlets needs to be sufficient to comply with the Core Strategy</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15981	Trevor Beckwith			no	<p>Why the proposal to improve the link to Moreton Hall; is it to share the gridlock?</p> <p>What evidence exists that people want newly located garden allotments and food producing spaces (who dreamt up that one?) rather than what we old folk call gardens?</p>	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process. The suggested link to Moreton Hall would be for pedestrians and cyclists to access employment and schools without the need to use cars, adding to potential congestion.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15984	Nigel Gough	CPBigwoods	Euronight Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd/ Frontsouth Developments Ltd		This is covered by our answer above that this site is already in receipt of the grant of planning permission.	These issues of development are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A detailed planning application has not been considered for the site.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock				7. I note that in the development for the South East side of Bury that a relief road is to be built right through the development. Who wants 40 ton lorries coming through a housing estate at all hours of the day?	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			yes		Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR15994	Colin Campbell	Savills	Countryside Properties	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15997	John M G Carnegie			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR16003	Colin and Faith Stabler			no	Too many houses, not enough specific detail about size or proposed numbers of people who wish to live in them.	The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and the associated housing requirement is valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16006	S J Greig			no	Yes, abandon the plans for development.	This is not an option. The area is allocated for development in the core strategy, CS 11.	No changes required
BVR16016	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council has no objections, in principle, to the proposed option for this site. We are and will continue to work with the developer and the borough council on the development of this site, in relation to the county council's strategic and service delivery interests, and will make more detailed comments through this process. The details relating to the layout of this site may change as a result of this work.	This will be a requirement in the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			<p>The Core Strategy requires community and leisure facilities to be included as part of this development, but it is not clear from this diagram as to where they would be located. We assume that these facilities would be clustered close to the retail and employment centre, but this perhaps ought to be made clear on this diagram.</p> <p>Whilst it is perhaps too detailed a consideration for this document, the Bury Vision 2031 document might set out a principle that each of the 5 strategic growth sites should be distinctive; a place in its own right, compatible with the character of Bury St Edmunds.</p>	see above	see above

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16021	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7 of the Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments)		no	We object to the development of this site for the reasons given in our responses to questions 4, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All areas that are proposed to be developed should be reviewed and the total number of houses to be built reduced. What areas, or parts of areas, that remain for development after this would depend on the results of the review and local residents' wishes.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 41, page 72 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. A further hard copy of the petition will be delivered to the Council as part of this submission. Please note that there was a failure to record the 107 responses and petition in the official figures and consultation feedback report during the previous phase of the Vision consultation process. We are, in good faith, and in light of the Council's request in Item 1.9, page 7, submitting this single unified response on the basis that it is recorded in the official feedback as coming from the 107 residents. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding the expansion plans for the Town and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>			<p>Special Landscape Area. Under no circumstances should the special landscape area be developed. If such landscapes are needed to satisfy the expansion plans, then this can only indicate that the town has reached a natural maximum size and should be developed no further.</p>	<p>The inclusion of part of the area within a special Landscape Area does not necessarily prevent that part of the site coming forward for development. It is essential that a landscape assessment considers the merits of all parts of the site in a comprehensive and cohesive manner.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16033	Richard Mortlock	Mildenhall Road Estate Residents Association		no	Extends too far and is in flood plain. River Lark corridor should be protected - walks etc	Those areas located within floodplain will not be developed. The riverside walk is included in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR16035	John Roe			yes	No	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR16036	Mr D Short			no	Yes. This plan would take up valuable cropland in an important and beautiful landscape. Another 1250 homes is not a sustainable option. This area, around the River Lark, should be protected, treasured and nourished.	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010.	No changes required
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21278E	B Gottgens			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21317E	Michael Harris			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21336E	Tom Crisp			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			no	AS above do not need to develop further	The principle of developing this area has already been established by the Core Strategy adopted in 2010. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21488E	D A Mewes			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton Hart			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21554E	David Mewes			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21559E	Joanna Mayer			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21563E	Nicholas Sibbett	Woodland Ways		no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21564E	Diane Hind	St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Northgate Ward		no	The road from Rougham Road roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road which should also link to Rookery Junction. Otherwise there will be complete Grid lock at Bury East A14 interchange affecting traffic from Sainsbury to Cullum road as well as on the A14	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21607E	R H Footer			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21623E	Matthew Lamplough				THE A134 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT PRIOR TO BUILD RELIEF ROAD LOOKS PRIME RAT RUN BEFORE ITS BUILT	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21642E	Mr & Mrs MJ Bray			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21649E	Christopher P Kelly			no	The road from the Rougham Road roundabout to Sicklesmere Road needs to be a relief road i.e. there should be no direct access from the road to facilities, not a speed restricted high street. The relief road also needs to link to the Rookery junction on the A14. If these improvements are not provided there will be complete grid lock at Bury East A14 interchange affecting traffic from Sainsbury's to Cullum Road as well as on the A14.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			no	The road needs to be a relief road with direct access to the A14. The road network is already under great strain.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21701E	William Charnaud			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21719E	Paul Hopfensperger	Body and Mind Studio Limited	Risbygate Street Traders Association	no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			no	What about Southgate Green Junction on the A134.It will not cope. Current Roads need to be improved before build starts	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21732E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row					No changes required
BVR21733E	Ian Hawxwell			no	The proposed health campus could go in the northern section of this development. This would give it good links to the A14 and avoid building houses so close to the main road.	West Bury is considered to be the most appropriate location for the health campus, as set out in the document and confirmed in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
BVR21737E	K & A Bishop			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
BVR21729E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk		no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21755E	S D Calvert			yes		Thank you for your support	No changes required
BVR21760E	Eddie Gibson			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21759E	Clare Bland	Indigo Planning	Threadneedle Property Investment	no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Question 48: Preferred Options Strategic Site South-east

Reference	Name	Organisation company if applicable	Organisation company	Question 48a - Do you agree with the preferred option for the development of this site?	Question 48b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option? If yes please set out these changes below.	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			no	The commissioned traffic survey needs to be available for consultation at the next stage especially the impact at the Sicklesmere and Sainsbury roundabouts and the later with the A14.	The road system will need to be upgraded to accommodate development. These details are addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan. A town wide traffic assessment is being undertaken as part of this process.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR21770E	Emma Ball			no opinion		Thank you for your comments	No changes required
BVR21772E	Julia Wakelam			no opinion	I do not have enough local knowledge to comment on this	Thank you for your comments	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15690	Mr R G C Williams			I am amazed that a "Vision" should ignore the community to the East of Barnham village, for whilst it is a short distance from the centre of the village, it does consist of 77 houses and should be included.	This community is recognised however, it falls within an area of countryside and is not an area which has been identified for further growth.	No changes required
BVR15699	Joanna Mayer			I am very concerned about the expansion of the town towards the outlying villages, especially towards the north-east Bury St Edmunds/Great Barton	The separation of Bury St Edmunds from Great Barton and Cattishall is addressed in the concept statement and will be developed further in the masterplan.	Address issues through the masterplan process
BVR15700	n/a			I do not know why you send these planning propositions. All Bury residents know that whatever they recommend you Jobsworths take no notice, the plans have been sorted and passed, and our once lovely town is slowly being demolished. The last job this Council managed to mess up was King Rd. We were told all heavy traffic was to leave Bury via Andrews St North - that was a lie. We were to have trees and flowers - nothing.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
BVR15701	V. M. Bartlett			You have not mentioned why you are making these plans. I also suggest you build a desalination plant on the east coast before any development takes place.	The plans are being made to accommodate the future growth of the town to the period 2031.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15711	Adrian Williams			<p>I am writing in a personal capacity with a letter, which is supplementary to the one sent by 38 residents of Byfield Way on March 17th 2012. Along with the reasons stated in that letter, and following the taking of professional advice, I wish to add the points in question 12.</p> <p>It is not really my brief to comment on the overall vision for 2031 but I must say I think that if that vision were realised, we would become like so many towns in Essex.</p>	The Bury St Edmunds Vision caters specifically for the individual needs of the town.	No changes required
BVR15734	Mr E Allen (Supported by 9 residents)		St Mary's Court	<p>Proposal for the development of land between Jacqueline Close and Kings Road:</p> <p>We refer to the above proposal and wish to make you aware that we would strongly oppose any plan to provide access to the site via Mill Road South. This road is always congested and often busy with pedestrians, motor vehicles and cyclists. It is narrow and due to the congestion only permits single-way traffic. Any increase in traffic would be detrimental to health and safety and aggravate the problems referred to above.</p>	The comments are noted and a requirement has been inserted in the policy for a development brief which will examine the traffic issues in relation to the two sites in more detail. The number of dwellings on the Jacqueline Road site has been reduced to 30 in recognition of the environmental constraints on the site.	Requirement for a development brief for BV10 b and c added to the policy. Number of dwellings on site b reduced to 30.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15737	Michael Farrell			<p>In principal I do not see the need to expand the town any more than at present - current facilities will be seriously overstretched by any expansion and the town will lose much of its present uniqueness - however, as it has been stated that 'expansion is inevitable' I would like to comment on the proposals to expand to the west of the town that include a new hospital, as these will affect me the most.</p> <p>The housing should be to the east of the site although integrated as painlessly as possible with existing housing on Oliver Road and of mixed size. Possibly a park like buffer zone although this will likely be used, as the field is at present, as a rubbish tip.</p> <p>Why not be really radical and build houses that include good contemporary design using good quality materials!</p>	These issues have been considered in the production of a final concept statement for the site which is attached as an appendix to the Bury St Edmunds Vision document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Farrell			<p>Existing shops and community facilities to be improved.</p> <p>Existing oddly truncated cycle path to be extended to Westley village.</p> <p>Bypass for Westley village, preferably sunk and protected by a tree belt, and Fornham lane closed to prevent it being used as a 'rat run' which will be inevitable if the bypass is too convoluted.</p> <p>The proposal for a hospital on the site can only have been made by a person of very little vision! A hospital is a commercial building and has no place next to a residential development. I know of no other small town where the hospital has been built so close to a residential area, the Norfolk and Norwich being a good example having been built on a research park well away from housing.</p>	<p>The hospital serves a sub-regional purpose for the whole of West Suffolk, not just Bury St Edmunds. The location is not many miles from Bury St Edmunds, it is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Farrell			The current habit of health authorities to charge even more than local authorities for parking necessarily forces both staff, patients and visitors to search for alternative, free, parking which will inevitably be in the surrounding streets , as occurs with the present hospital.(The current campaign for relief by the local residents being an example) An excellent site exists on the other side of the A14 opposite the entrance to Bury St Edmunds Golf Club. It is in a valley helping to conceal the buildings but still gives excellent access to all the main arteries in and around the town.	See above	See above
BVR15751	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council		In summary, Breckland Council: I Notes that delivery of the actions to meet the aspirations of the document are not clearly stated. ii Notes that there is a lack of delivery, monitoring and implementation framework in the DPD. iii Objects to the DPDs on the grounds of a lack of a policy and monitoring framework on the impact of development in the Borough on protected sites through recreational and urban effects on the Breckland SPA. iv Objects to lack of reference to the potential for cross boundary working.	i. an aspiration and action delivery plan accompanies the document as background evidence. li and iii. Appendix 5 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework iv. References have been made to the cross boundary working which has taken place to produce this document.	i. an aspiration and action delivery plan accompanies the document as background evidence. li and iii. Appendix 5 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework iv. References have been made to the cross boundary working which has taken place to produce this document.

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council		v Requests that the role of Thetford for rural areas to the north of the Borough be fully appreciated; and vi Objects to the preferred approach to residential and employment allocation in Risby as it fails to meet the Core Strategy requirements as proposals are not fully screened.	v. The role of Thetford has been acknowledged in those villages to the north of the borough in the Rural Vision. vi. Additional words have been included in the Risby policy in the Rural Vision to ensure that a project level HRA is considered at the planning application stage. This is also reflected in the HRA Screening which accompanies the document.	v. The role of Thetford has been acknowledged in those villages to the north of the borough in the Rural Vision. vi. Additional words have been included in the Risby policy in the Rural Vision to ensure that a project level HRA is considered at the planning application stage. This is also reflected in the HRA Screening which accompanies the document.
BVR15770	Quentin Cornish			And can I just say what a very unhelpful format this is for gaining feedback? There is nowhere to make general comments, and it is very difficult to make the necessary connections between the various interconnected elements of the Vision without constantly having to repeat oneself. It may make processing the answers easy, so it's lovely for you, but it's unwieldy and bureaucratic for us as consultees. Maybe next time you might consider trying to design it to make it easy to use from the consultees' point of view? A bit radical, I know ...	Thank you for your observations. We are continually reviewing how we present consultations whilst ensuring that we meet our statutory requirements.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15771	Stephen Faulker	Norfolk County Council		<p>Thank you for consulting the County Council on the above LDFs.</p> <p>The officer-level comments below are made on a without prejudice basis and the County Council reserves the right to make further comments at later stages of the local plan process.</p> <p>I would make the following comments:</p> <p>(a) the need to consider, as part of the LDF preparation, any potential strategic cross-boundary issues particularly in relation to strategic transport matters and education provision. There may also be other cross-boundary infrastructure delivery issues which will need to be considered through the emerging LDF/Infrastructure Planning process.</p>	a) Cross boundary working has taken place throughout the production of the document and this is referenced in the introduction	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Faulker	Norfolk County Council		(b) Norfolk County Council are pursuing a new initiative called Norfolk Trails which will update the existing network of cycle routes, walks, bridle paths etc and intends to package them as 9 strategic green routes or trails supported by public transport. These will replicate existing models such as "The Great Trail" in Scotland and "Discovering Kent". It is intended that they will provide access between market towns and villages for residents, workers, visitors and events. They will also provide opportunities for a county wide economic impetus for the service and tourism industry by encouraging businesses to develop in their vicinity. Therefore in view of the Borough Council's close proximity to Thetford and Thetford Forest; Norfolk County Council would welcome the opportunity to work with St Edmundsbury BC to link our trails initiative to your proposals to offer a seamless leisure/recreational connection for visitors wishing to visit places of interest within both our areas.	b) We acknowledge the comments and welcome the opportunity to work with the county on cross boundary issues	No changes required
	Stephen Faulker	Norfolk County Council		As you will be aware the Localism Act (November 2011), sets out a "duty to cooperate" on the production of plans which relate to strategic matters.	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15772	Richard Dubery			<p>Further to the exchanges of e-mail regarding the Vision 2031, my wife and I visited the exhibition at The Apex last Saturday.</p> <p>From the plans on show, the points raised above remain pertinent and I wish them to be taken into account as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>Especially important are the points regarding capacity on the roads which even with building your planned "relief roads", will not eliminate the congestion and your idea that not everyone will use the roads (likely to use bus & cycle) does not hold water. If there was going to be high bus and cycle use, it would be evident already given the high price of fuel !</p>	The Council considers that this issue is addressed in 7.19. This paragraph highlights the importance of developers working together to assess the impact of sites of traffic.	No changes required
BVR15782	D A Howell			Thank you for the consultation exercise and the opportunity to comment, I hope that it is a genuine consultation. I will readily comment further if required.	Thank you for your comments	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15785	Elizabeth Hodder			<p>I received a leaflet from Fornham All Saints Parish Council recently, about Vision 2031. The opening line was allegedly a quote from you, saying '...growth is inevitable.'</p> <p>You may have seen the letter from Alan Murdie in this week's Bury Free Press which addresses this point. I'd be very interested indeed to know why '...growth is inevitable' before Consultation document responses have even been considered. I certainly haven't voted for expansion, and from the letters in our local paper to date, no one seems to be keen on the idea.</p> <p>Where has the mandate for this inevitable growth come from?</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR15788	Paul R. Bridges			I hope the consultation isn't just an appeasement exercise for the residents of FAS and that their views are carefully listened to and taken into account every step of the way.	The council considers all of the consultation responses received	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15799	Anthony Peck			<p>Please note that I do not accept Cllr John Griffiths comments that "further growth is inevitable". Bury is a pleasant Market Town and does not need to be turned into a City.</p> <p>Priority should be given to sorting out the current well known problems with infrastructure before any more development is even considered.</p> <p>National Government planning reforms allow Councils a 12 month transition period to adapt or revise local plans and I suggest that SEBC should actually listen to residents concerns and amend their plans accordingly.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
BVR15800	Davis & Kay Thompson			<p>In conclusion, on the broader issue of all the proposed areas of development, in and around Bury St Edmunds, we do feel there is a danger of Bury growing too big a population for the size of amenities in the town centre for which this lovely market town is renown. Parking, use of leisure facilities, secondary schools, to name but a few, will all be squeezed and Bury will maybe begin to lose its unique market town appeal we have grown to love over 25 years of living in or nearby</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents. The Vision document seeks to preserve the uniqueness of the town whilst planning for the future.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15805	Roderick Rees	Bury St Edmunds Society		The Society is anxious that the planning process should not be wholly developer driven. We query whether the Authority has the staffing levels required to monitor these new schemes.	The council will continue to meet its statutory obligation in the provision of planning policy and determination of planning applications	No changes required
BVR15810	Christopher Spicer			<p>Personally, I do not wish Bury St. Edmunds (now referred to as Bury) to expand any further. I concur with the views of our MP David Ruffley, whom I am sure is supported by the majority of the town's population. However, as a long serving member of the Sustainable Development Working Party , I must accept that Bury, historically, will expand in line with its economy.</p> <p>It has been wise to have adopted a core strategy although we are not obliged to use it as tactics. I took a very close interest at the time , some 3 years ago, in the then public consultation. This disappointed me as some responders were those hoping for personal gain. The present consultation has been more interesting. People are waking up to the danger to their villages and communities. I have spoken with the Howard Estate and they and the Mildenhall Estate do not want a third estate joined on to them.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Spicer			<p>The residents of the Fornhams now realise that the North West relief road will not deter us from using Fornham All Saints as an unofficial Bury by-pass.</p> <p>Also, only one field planted with trees , instead of 2, would separate them from Bury. We must listen to the people. In 100 years we shall not be thanked for absorbing the Fornhams and Westley into Bury (despite their easy access to the A14). Remember what has happened to Whitton, Kesgrave and Rushmere, now joined to Ipswich!</p> <p>We shall need more houses but it is essential to use Brownfield sites first, both in Bury and the villages. The obligation on builders to provide low cost housing must be removed as this makes the sites less profitable. Also, we must relax the constraints of sustainability. Most of my villages would welcome small development, but this is not permitted. We now live in the motor age, no longer the bicycle age.</p>	The need for growth in Bury St Edmunds is immediate and not all brownfield sites are capable of being delivered in the short term. Whereas priority is given to brownfield sites, the development of greenfield sites cannot be stalled.	No changes required
	Christopher Spicer			In conclusion, my vote , when the economy or growing older dictate, , will be a preference for the A134 opposite Nowton Park with the vital link to the A14, then Moreton Hall extension with a railway halt, but NEVER the Fornhams or Westley.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15886	Cyril Leach			<p>You are probably aware that there is much opposition to the 2031 Vision proposals to build some 7000 new houses in our area. Council officers have sought to suggest that the boat has sailed and that no major revisions to the plans can be countenanced - although suggestions for marginal tinkering would be carefully considered.</p> <p>But the recent National Government planning reforms gives our Council a chance to think again. The Government have stated that "Councils will be allowed a 12-month transition period to adapt or revise local plans". The Minister responsible (Greg Clark) has said that Councils undertaking developments must recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside". But this is just the point where many people in Bury Object. The "Vision" proposals will introduce adverse radical changes to the character of Bury ST Edmunds in a way which will destroy the traditional ethos of the town.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Cyril Leach			<p>One Councillor keeps repeating the view that "there is no alternative to the present proposals". But a moment's thought should convince you that there are alternatives - some of which have not yet received the consideration they deserve.</p> <p>I look to you - as the Leader of the Council - to use the changes in Government policies - to reopen the discussion about the proposed developments. If you are convinced that the "Vision" proposals are the only way ahead might ask that the issue be put to a referendum of Bury people to ensure that the present massive proposals have general support rather than the support of Councillors and senior members of staff?</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR15914	The Hon James Broughton	Barton Stud		<p>Thank you for your invitation to comment on the further details of the preferred option for development to the north-east of St. Edmundsbury.</p> <p>I should point out that our wider landholdings are subject to a development option agreement with Berkeley Strategic who will be submitting separate representations on the draft Area Action Plan.</p> <p>On behalf of Barton Stud, I can confirm: Our agreement to Policy BV5 - Strategic Site - North East Bury St Edmunds as proposed. (Question 8) Our endorsement of the Preferred Option for the development of the Strategic Site. (Question 48).</p>	The support is noted	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	The Hon James Broughton	Barton Stud		I can confirm that it is our intention to continue the operation of the Stud as the town grows in accordance with the Action Plan. Whilst we note that the Stud, which has been owned and run by my family since 1925, is not addressed specifically within an Action Plan policy, we welcome and look forward to the Council-s support in the Stud-s future development and continued success. We note the draft stage of the Action Plan and that further consultation will be taking place. We look forward, therefore, to future opportunities to comment on the proposals within the Action Plan. Should you have any queries in relation to the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me at the address provided.	See above	No changes required
BVR15918	Alan Murdie			Question 33 The Council does not have a commitment to art or culture. It has leased the Corn Exchange to a pub chain, closed the Manor House Museum and seriously damaged the appreciation and preservation of existing collections and wholly failed to understand their significance.	The Council remains committed to leisure and culture as evidenced by the actions and aspirations in that section.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15934	Chris Anderson			<p>Since West Bury is one of the key sites earmarked for major development there is obviously significant concern over the impact on our village community. However, we are optimistic that the consultation, reinforced by the spirit of the NPPF just published, will; be more than just a 'tick-box' process to meet statutory obligations; be responsive to the concerns and the constructive ideas from the communities of Bury St Edmunds; and ultimately seek to manage growth more sympathetically.</p> <p>In this respect we have invested considerable effort to consider the Vision 2031 document and offer views, ideas and recommendations in a thorough and constructive manner. To assist in its consideration we have included an Executive Summary with an overview of our recommendations. However, we would commend SEBC's senior members to consider the totality of the Westley response.</p>	Comments noted	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson			<p>Furthermore, we are keen to start a dialogue with you and your teams, and we do feel that we also need to ask for your support to help Westley build a Neighbourhood Plan. This will aid all parties as the developers seek to move forward with the proposed development.</p> <p>Westley Parish Council - A Summary of Key Recommendations: Westley Parish Council recommend that in taking Vision 2031 forward that SEBC should:</p> <p>1. Publish the housing evidence base and provide the rationale for new housing following the abolition of regional strategies.</p> <p>2. Explore the reasons why Suffolk County Council (and SEBC) has discounted the idea of a brand new town settlement to minimise excessive growth demands on towns without sufficient infrastructure.</p>	1. The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson			<p>3. Make specific time-related links between housing, and the supporting themes of employment, infrastructure, health and green issues. Hard metrics should be shared so that there is the provision to phase housing starts with the success - or otherwise - of providing those vital elements.</p> <p>4. Modify the preferred option for the Bury West location to incorporate a more robust buffer to prevent the coalescence of Westley Village as required by other SEBC policies.</p> <p>5. State explicitly that the West Bury relief road is a precondition for any development on the Bury West site, and communicate this formally to the potential developers.</p> <p>6. Provide clarification and consultation over the definition of amenity space.</p> <p>7. Support Westley Village and Westley Parish Council with assistance in the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>2. The idea of a new settlement was explored and rejected during the projection of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>3. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies this document which sets out how the Vision will be delivered.</p> <p>4-6. These issues are dealt with as part of the revised concept statement</p> <p>7. The council notes Westley Parish Councils intention to prepare a neighbourhood plan and will provide appropriate support</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Anderson			<p>8. Revisit the locating of the Health Campus in the light of the ideas presented in this response. This should provide a clearer justification for the use of a Greenfield site and explain why alternative sites were rejected. It should specify the transport infrastructure implications, which will be required. Since the Health Campus is planned for a much later phase of the overall plan, there is adequate scope for ensuring that these new ideas are considered and decisions more publicly shared.</p> <p>9. State the preferred options for the existing Hardwick Lane Hospital site, should the new Health Campus be built. Since Vision 2031 is making provision within this timescale for a new hospital location then SEBC should reveal the strategy for the existing site, of some 19 Hectares. This will be a Brownfield site, which should be a priority for development before any Greenfield development takes place.</p>	<p>8. The location of the Health Campus was determined in the Core Strategy. 9. It is too early to determine the uses for the existing Hospital site as the relocation will not take place until the end of the plan period.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15935	Richard Russell			We have lived in the town centre for a number of years, having moved here from inner London to be closer to family. We chose Bury because we thought that the centre, though not the outskirts, was particularly attractive in architectural and environmental terms. Another attraction was the small scale of the town which means that one can walk to everything one needs (shops, restaurants, cinema/theatre, hospital, railway station etc.). One of the disadvantages that has become apparent to us is that the promotion of drinking establishments with extended licensing hours in the town centre can have some pretty undesirable consequences in terms of anti-social behaviour.	Crime and safety is an issue which is addressed within the Bury Vision 2031 document. Positive planning seeks to enhance the town centre area for the benefit of all.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Russell			<p>Various studies of new housing development in existing towns and cities have quite reasonably suggested that if no thought nor provision is made, particularly for young people, this can result in significant numbers feeling that their only chance of any fun is to go into the nearest centre offering a choice of pubs and bars on weekend evenings to try to drink away their frustrations.</p> <p>So having skimmed through your document BSE Vision/2031 some thoughts that come to mind are:-</p> <p>1) How can such a large increase in population be accommodated without jeopardizing one of the main assets of the town, which is its attractive centre, and without turning it into a Soho-style mecca for clubbers and drinkers where no normal people want to live any more?. And how to provide meaningful local facilities, particularly for young people, as part and parcel of new housing developments?</p>	<p>Growth within designated areas of Bury is an opportunity to promote the vitality and viability of the town centre. Areas where there is to be growth is dependent upon the design being of good quality and making suitable provision to the needs of the locality. Growth would help provide needed infrastructure provision within the town centre which would help maintain its viability in a modern age whilst retaining the historic character of the town.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Russell			<p>2) How to provide so much new housing which is not just more of the recent and dismal developer-led pattern that we can see on the edge of town, with its incoherent scattering of ill-proportioned boxes, completely devoid of landscaping or other redeeming features ?. Can we hope for some areas to be designed to a higher standard, which might even be considered as exemplars of future development, embodying such ambitions as:- zero carbon development</p> <p>a) architect-led rather than developer-led developments, and some competition design sites as well b) developments with a serious landscape design input, with ring-fenced budgets for landscaping developments where sympathetic people-friendly hard surfaces link houses, rather than the awful black car-priority tarmac strip</p>	The vision document is not intended to be prescriptive for the design and type of housing development. There are policies elsewhere in the Local Plan which establish the criteria against which applications will be assessed. The Vision document seeks to ensure good quality design that addresses the needs of the town and is expected to result in good quality development.	No changes required
	Richard Russell			<p>c) developments where people can plant vegetables and wild flowers in deliberate left-over spaces integrated within developments d) developments for co-operative living with communal crèche spaces, and communal workshops for DIY etc., to promote interdependent living between the generations</p>	Allotments and the availability of public open space are issues which are addressed within the document.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Russell			3) You mention in your report alternative means of getting about rather than by private car, which is to be welcomed, particularly in view of the impending obesity timebomb, not to mention growing pressure to take action on the climate change front before it is too late. But these alternatives must be made an absolute priority of development, and not remain an optional wish for a developer to ignore. It should be possible to cycle to all main hubs safely on segregated routes (station, hospital etc.), and to places for outdoor leisure such as Ickworth Park and the Kings Forest.	Sustainable transport is a common theme throughout the document, particularly in the Transport section. The individual travel requirements of any proposed developments would be assessed in detail at the time of a development being proposed.	No changes required
BVR15939	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		<p>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>The approach to plan making. The Bury Town Labour Party congratulates the Borough Council on the holistic approach it has taken to considering, and planning for the future of, Bury St Edmunds and its townspeople. It has rightly reflected the considerable research which has been undertaken in 'aspirations', 'actions' and 'policies' and, by noting the aspirations which arise from seeking the views of the community, defined what needs to be done to make the town a better place in which to live and work.</p>	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		The content and presentation of Vision 2031. However, members found the presentation of the information in Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 very confusing. Their concerns are in part due to the design and layout of the document and, more seriously, to the interweaving of 'aspirations' and proposed 'actions' with the proposed 'policies' (other than those which allocate the development sites). In the next version of the plan which is produced it will be important to separate with clarity the development control policies, and the supporting text which they require, from the 'aspirations' and 'actions' in the document. The situation is made worse by the fact that the majority of the development control policies have already been included in the Joint Development Management Polices Document (DMPD) and those in Vision 2031 appear to be little more than afterthoughts.	It is acknowledged that the Local Plan currently contains a number of different documents which can be confusing, however the Vision documents are primarily site allocation documents to guide the location of future growth in the town.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		<p>The logical approach would be to add the development control policies in Vision 2031 to the DMPD. This would leave the Vision 2031 document with the site allocation policies, and a record of the aspirations and actions which while important are not material in planning policy terms.</p> <p>Bury Town Labour Party Branch standpoint. The decision to support in principle the projected increase in housing up to 2031 has been arrived at in the knowledge that the housing numbers have already been approved in the adopted Core Strategy. If housing numbers are not increased the pressure for further growth in the locality will lead to significant increases in prices which will exclude ever greater numbers of local people from the housing market - particularly those who at present are already unable to afford the accommodation they would like to buy - and a failure to provide much needed additional affordable housing.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Eleanor Rehahn	Bury Town Branch Labour Party		<p>However, the Party's in principle support for the additional housing in the plan comes with the qualification that in the case of each of the proposed developments the necessary essential infrastructure and services for the scheme must be in place before any houses are occupied. Further, the wider problems of the community such as public transport must be properly addressed and resolved. In order to ensure that these matters are properly tackled before development takes place it may be that the development of some areas has to be delayed. This is the price which it will be necessary to pay to ensure that as the town continues to expand, that its existing residents are not placed at further disadvantage, and those arriving in the community find it lives up to their expectations. The Branch will be monitoring the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities and will be campaigning to ensure that these meet current and projected needs before new development takes place.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The layout of the document shall be amended to suit the next stage in the consultation process . This shall ensure the suitability of the document to its purpose.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15941	Colin Murphy			<p>I would like the development of Bury St Edmunds (centre and suburbs) to be enhanced by including protected areas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 'green oasis' areas for quiet recreational activities such as walking, bird watching, fishing and model boating * existing water areas - such as the British Sugar lagoon - to be developed as recreational areas - ideal for model boating, walking, bird watching * 'active sport' areas for ball games, cycling, skateboarding - away from the 'green oasis' areas * more allotments and initiatives to encourage town people to grow their own, get active and help with the environment (I've been on the waiting list for years by the way) <p>I expect you are aware that there are a number of organisations that might wish to get involved in helping to develop such areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Suffolk Wildlife Trust * Saxon Model Boat Club * Bury St Edmunds Angling Club * RSPB * Woodland Trust 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Overall ecology and provision of public open space within the Town is addressed within the document. Specific sites need to be addressed based on specific planning applications and where it is viable to do so.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Murphy			<p>I live in the centre of Bury for convenience and everyday enjoy the few oasis areas in the town and would love to see this expanded. I believe that town and country can and should enhance each other.</p> <p>I'm a member of the Saxon Model Boat Club and I'm expressing the 'model boating' view on behalf of other members of the club who previously had an arrangement with British Sugar to sail on the lagoon. The membership of the club was extensive at that time and had clubs from other areas visiting to take advantage of the great facilities. We'd like to see this returned.</p>	The use of land owned by British Sugar would be a matter for discussion with the organisation directly.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15946	Michael Brabrook			<p>If St Edmundsbury Borough Council adopts the Bury Vision 2031 strategy that decision I believe should be subjected to a Judicial Review for reasons set out above and below. Further, all land necessary for such a development should be compulsorily purchased at agricultural land values so that no landowner benefits from the council's decision.</p> <p>I was born in Bury St Edmunds, I live in Great Barton and I feel passionate about its future and also the surrounding villages. Many of the people making decisions about our future do not live locally nor were they born here. If they make a cock-up about its future development, as was done with Haverhill in the 1960s, they can console themselves that they do not have to live in the mess that they have created.</p> <p>Land owners around Bury stand to benefit substantially, 50 million could be 100 million, if this development goes ahead. I believe this is the driving force for this development rather than necessity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This document seeks to ensure that proper planning is applied to ensure that Bury St Edmunds does not expand with excessive urban sprawl into surrounding villages which could result in them losing their individual character. The development of strategic sites is intended to maintain a separation from existing villages.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Brabrook			<p>Further, Great Barton residents have not had their views represented at St Edmundsbury Borough Council meetings, which is their democratic right, because Councillor Sarah Broughton has to withdraw because of a conflict of interest in that her family will benefit from any development on their land by the A143.</p> <p>I feel Councillor Sarah Broughton should have resigned as Great Barton's Borough Councillor immediately there was any possibility of farming land belonging to her family being given planning permission. A by-election could have been held and we could have been represented by someone who has nothing to gain.</p>	Comments on the document are accepted from all parties.	No changes required
	Michael Brabrook			<p>At MP David Ruffley's public meeting on Thursday 26th April we were informed that Councillor Sarah Mildmay-White can only purport to represent our views. If she truly wanted to represent us she would have attended our recent Great Barton Parish Council AGM held on Monday 16th April to hear our views, she would have attended at least one Parish Council Meeting. She could have advertised the fact that she was representing us. She might even have restrained herself from writing letters to Bury Free Press strongly supporting the vision statement.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Brabrook			Villagers can take some development but this should be done on the direction away from Bury so as to maintain the existing separation between villages and town. For example, Suffolk County Council already own large areas of land around the A143/Mill Road junction in Great Barton. This land is already in public ownership. Developing this land on a larger scale than envisaged in the Rural 2031 Vision document but still within the scale of the existing community would allow Great Barton to grow but at a sustainable rate. Other villages could be developed in a similar way.	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15957	Alexandra Beale			<p>The following answers to this questionnaire are my response to this proposed development of Bury St Edmunds. My family and I will be one of the families, in my view, most affected by the development of both Moreton Hall and on land to the north east of Bury St Edmunds heading towards Cattishall and Great Barton.</p> <p>I live in one of two cottages that sits adjacent to Mount Road and which, should this development go ahead will be surrounded on all sides by new properties developed by Taylor Wimpey.</p> <p>The wording of the policy document clearly states that any new development should not affect nor encroach on existing communities. Cherry Trees and Ambleside cottages are included in the hamlet of Cattishall and have been split only by the railway. Any such development in this area would completely change the style of occupation in these two cottages.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Any new development would be required to address the context of the area in accordance with an adopted masterplan. The details would be assessed at the stage of a application being submitted. Any new development would be required to have suitable attenuation to its impacts on existing development in the area.</p>	<p>Issues to be dealt with at masterplan stage</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15958	Gavin Beale			<p>The following answers to this questionnaire are my response to this proposed development of Bury St Edmunds. My family and I will be one of the families, in my view, most affected by the development of both Moreton Hall and on land to the north east of Bury St Edmunds heading towards Cattishall and Great Barton.</p> <p>I live in one of two cottages that sits adjacent to Mount Road and which, should this development go ahead will be surrounded on all sides by new properties developed by Taylor Wimpey.</p> <p>The wording of the policy document clearly states that any new development should not affect nor encroach on existing communities. Cherry Trees and Ambleside cottages are included in the hamlet of Cattishall and have been split only by the railway. Any such development in this area would completely change the style of occupation in these two cottages.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Any new development would be required to address the context of the area in accordance with an adopted masterplan. The details would be assessed at the stage of a application being submitted. Any new development would be required to have suitable attenuation to its impacts on existing development in the area.</p>	<p>Issues to be dealt with at masterplan stage</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15970	David Nettleton			<p>What residents really fear is that Bury St Edmunds expands but the local councils pretend that car use can continue as now. It's our duty to explain why the hierarchy of transport modes is the only viable option and that imposes obligations on planners to ensure this becomes a reality. Don't chicken out this time!</p> <p>The key word in the document: Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 - is 'Vision'. Each of us will conjure up a picture of what the town may look like 20 years hence. Putting this into words isn't easy. The best way I can do this is by relating my own experiences over the 21 years I have lived here and project this forward 20 years to 2032. For most of these past two decades I have been involved in local politics, first as a residents' group chairman from 1995, and then an elected councillor since 2003. In addition to my 'day job', until retirement in September 2009 aged 65, I have also worked as a relief postman and a census enumerator in 2001 so can claim familiarity with 80% of the streets and letter boxes in Bury.</p>	The comments are noted.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Nettleton			<p>Driving past somewhere in a car isn't quite as informative as observing on foot. You see more.</p> <p>My three children were born at West Suffolk Hospital and educating in Bury. I wasn't. I'm from Manchester and I've seen in the past what happens to areas in decline with boarded up houses and shops, high unemployment, increased crime rates and a feeling of helplessness. Any town or city which isn't going forward but tries to stand still, risks going into a downward spiral as investment migrates to more progressive conurbations.</p> <p>I have answered all 48 questions using the same numerical sequence. My knowledge and experience as an active resident of Bury St Edmunds since 1991 informs my opinions.</p>	The comments are noted.	No changes required
	David Nettleton			<p>Unlike some politicians I have no view as to how many people should live in Bury or the size of the town but firmly believe that the responsible local authority - in this case St Edmundsbury Borough Council - should provide a planning framework in consultation with residents. The Vision 2031 document does just that.</p>		

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15973	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	<p>For the reasons set out above, we propose the following changes on soundness grounds:</p> <p>Objective 4 should be amended for consistency with the Core Strategy and NPPF.</p> <p>Policy BV9 should be amended to clarify that the foodstore will be restricted to a discount foodstore of 1,548 sq.m gross, in accordance with the adopted Masterplan, the Council's evidence base and the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy BV10 and BV11 should clarify that retail development is not permitted as a 'mixed' or 'commercial' use. Where retail development is proposed, a sequential and retail assessment will be required in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	These changes have been considered in the questions/policies referred to.	See responses to questions referred to.
	Alistair Ingram	Barton Willmore LLp	Waitrose Ltd	<p>Policy BV17 should make specific reference to bulky goods only, to ensure consistency with supporting text and the NPPF.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Aspiration 1) should refer to the 'Town Centre' and not the 'Town' and should include specific reference to directing future development to the town centre in the first instance.</p> <p>Chapter 16 should clarify the scale of retailing at the Strategic Growth Areas and require a Retail Assessment to be submitted in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15979	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council	As above	<p>Please see attached objection from Cattishall residents. Summary points: Cattishall Residents formally object to Policy BV5 of Bury Vision 2031 due to the fact that as drafted the plan contains no guarantee that it will -afford them, the wider landscape, and the residents of Great Barton adequate and permanent protection; and -that no assurance has been given that the necessary landscaping work will be undertaken shortly after the formal allocation of the site in order to ensure that they and the wider parish are appropriately protected at the time when construction work commences on site. In this connection it is unfair that within the plan the proposed housing development is in effect a 'certainty' but the proposed landscaping is no more than an 'option'. Regard to basic planning principles requires that in cases such as this the amenity of existing residents should be protected in the public interest.</p>	These issues have been addressed in the revised concept plan and will be addressed at the masterplan stage	These issues have been addressed in the revised concept plan and will be addressed at the masterplan stage
	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council		The plan should be amended to ensure that the Residents are granted adequate protection, and the work is carried in sufficient time to ensure that it is in place when work on site commences.	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15983	Paul Elkin			<p>Better maintenance and finishing off of details</p> <p>4.1 Although St Edmundsbury is better than many at maintaining much of the existing landscape and urban infrastructure, I think there is still considerable room for improvement in many areas. For example, having already touched on better maintenance of the water meadows above, sections of the former Market paths which continue on from Friars Lane demonstrate the need for extensive improvement including the removal of old and redundant chain-line fencing and concrete posts in the vicinity of York Bridge, wholesale clearance of dumped rubbish and natural waste from the water courses. Also, the owners of properties that back onto the river Lark or Linnet rivers throughout the town seem to have little or scant regard for the look of what defines their boundary.</p>	Thank you for your comments. It is the intention of this document to outline overall development opportunities for the town. It does not seek to address the particular issues raised in this comment.	No changes required
	Paul Elkin			<p>Far from embracing the rivers and/or water meadow channels as an attractive feature at the end of their garden or alongside their property, they seem intent on using the scruffiest fencing or tipping their garden and other waste into the river.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Elkin			<p>4.2 Elsewhere, there is ample evidence of developers of newer properties, car parks and so forth simply not bringing the perimeter up to any reasonable standard. Where boundary borders have been planted or fences erected these are simply either neglected or of low grade in the first instance. Dumped and wind blown rubbish seems never to be collected and removed in certain locations throughout the district. Overall, I think there is room for huge improvement.</p> <p>5.0 Finally, I would be more than happy to work closely with any of the town's elected representatives and officer working groups in a private capacity to explore in detail any of the above issues I have raised. I am of course also keen to work through my local residents association, in this case the newly formed Southgate Street Association.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15986	Mr and Mrs A Sherlock			<p>My husband and I came to the displays at the Apex and gave our general views to one of your staff members. My husband and I have lived in Bury St Edmunds for 33 years at the above address and have seen all the changes made to the town, not all to our liking i.e. the Arc Development. Since we have lived here we have seen the tremendous increase in car usage and consequent daily congestion in this part of the town. This is particularly bad with all the traffic from Nowton Road, (The rat run instead of Sicklesmere Road), Wilks Road, Cullum Road, Southgate Street and Sicklesmere Road all converging on Rougham Hill to get out of town at all times of day. The reverse happens particularly in the mornings and evenings with traffic trying to get through this narrow road arrangement.</p> <p>I was going to complete the questionnaire but I found it unnecessarily complicated with all the referrals to other documents. So as time is running out I am outlining our objections to some of these plans.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Transport issues throughout the town are acknowledged within the document and actions have been set out to address these.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15988	Mark Ereira-Guyer			<p>I would like to ask St Edmundsbury to urgently review the number of houses it proposes for Bury St Edmunds as part of Vision 2031. 5900 extra homes is excessive, and would increase the total housing stock from the current 18,743 by a staggering and exponential 31%. This would detrimentally undermine forever the historic character and nature of the town. I outline this further - and with further points - in the attached article which was published by the Bury Free Press:</p> <p>Bury St Edmunds is a beautiful small market town, now on a precipice as it faces the possibilities of ruination and over-development. Yet, there is a glimmer of hope with the Government's newly initiated Localism powers, ostensibly to bring people back into the planning process. Giving you a voice to check unsustainable development and growth where you live; to say enough is enough.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Ereira-Guyer			<p>Now is the time to act, and as part of the Bury Free Press's debate to make your voice more loudly heard. We need special places like Bury to be maintained in the UK - otherwise our natural and built heritage will be lost to us, and future generations.</p> <p>Just a few years back your Borough Council decided to designate the town a 'centre for growth and development', encouraging developers to step forward and seemingly, in a reckless attempt to copy the hyper-development and edge-of-town house-building in other places like Ely, Braintree and Cambridge. The Council's intention is to allow up to half of the 10,000 houses earmarked for St Edmundsbury as a whole, to be built all over the countryside around the town's immediate 'green' environs. The equivalent of another four Moreton Halls! This is unnecessary and wanton environmentally vandalism on an epic scale.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Ereira-Guyer			<p>The villages of Fornham, Great Barton and Westley will be subsumed into the town, swallowed up by houses which are not being built to meet local affordable housing needs but the requirements of many of those attracted to working (but not the house prices) in Cambridge; all going up and down, unsustainably, the A14 in their cars.</p> <p>The town's transport infrastructure can not take the predicted growth, and permanent gridlock will be assured. I know as a County Councillor that we can't manage the massive increases in cars that this over-development will generate on the town's roads, despite valiant efforts to promote public transport, cycling and walking. The pressures on other public services and resources will be immense. The region is already experiencing prolonged periods of drought; water scarcity is major threat. More houses and people will compound these problems.</p>	The transport implications of the new growth have been assessed in a jointly commissioned county and borough council junction assessment which provides evidence to support this document	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Ereira-Guyer			With all this proposed development wildlife will not have a chance, being further marginalized with even fewer 'green' habitats; like people nature needs green space to thrive. And as stated by the RSBP many of the UK's most threatened species are already hemmed into some of the last remaining fragments of habitat. We need to be doing more to save what precious countryside is left rather than planning to get rid of it.	See above	See above
BVR15989	Mr and Mrs Dubery			With some of the jargon and official wording used in the document, are you sure all residents understand it? Is this therefore a fair consultation?	Thank you for your comments. The document is intended to address the needs to provide a technical summary of development sites as well as being understandable for those who would be affected by development.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR15991	Adrian and Ann Graves			<p>We write to present our comments and responses to the above consultation documents. These are taken and presented together, not least because we are of the view that the two strategies are inseparable - and should be reviewed together as a single cohesive approach. Where our comments relate to a specific question in one or other of the documents, these are identified as such.</p> <p>If revisions to some of the settlement boundaries proceed as proposed, then areas of some communities will actually shift from their current status under the Rural Vision to being incorporated within the Bury St. Edmunds Vision. Thus, the two 'Visions' should be considered together at this stage. In the case of Bury St. Edmunds, the proposals for fringe development directly impact on the villages of the Fornhams, Great Barton, Rougham and Westley. In the case of Haverhill, the impact directly affects Withersfield and Little Wratting, a number of 'Greens' and maybe, even Kedington.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The document sets out that the proposed development sites are to maintain a break between Fornham All Saints and surrounding settlements. The sites are considered to be the most sustainable locations to ensure the long term viability of the town with regard to global issues such as climate change and conservation needs. Any new development would need to have attenuation to existing policies in the Core Strategy and NPPF the require it to have regard to the character and appearance of the area. Any new development therefore shall be expected to address the needs of the locality.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves			<p>As we are residents of Great Barton, our comments are made in the general context of our commitment to that community and our wish to see the uniqueness of its nature, culture and vibrancy safely protected for the future.</p> <p>On the basis of structural considerations alone, the strategy and location of proposed development across Bury St. Edmunds should be reviewed and tested against alternative models. That said, we do recognise the need for growth and the provision of new homes. However, one has only to review the case histories and experiences of towns such as Haverhill to see what can occur when housing development is allowed to proceed before core infrastructure is created in advance to support it. It has taken Haverhill over 40 years to correct the issues presented by inadequate infrastructure, following its expansion as part of London Overspill in the 1960s.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves			<p>Finally, we would point to the example of other areas - Cambridgeshire in particular - which have turned to the creation of entirely new communities as a way of meeting future growth and housing need. Cambourne must be regarded as a success and, with the current closer integration of St. Edmundsbury and Forest Heath, a similar rounded community solution could be considered for the area generally around Red Lodge.</p> <p>The area is well served by both the A11 and the A14; it has a railway station (Kennett); it has a large number of brownfield sites and areas of poorly used land; it suffers from the historic departure of American service personnel and it is within easy reach of a sensible number of employment hubs and retail centres. Maybe it offers an alternative model to the currently envisaged, exponential changes to the towns and villages of West Suffolk - which include the irrevocable impact on Bury St. Edmunds and Great Barton in particular.</p>	The issue of a new settlement was considered and discounted during the production of the Core Strategy	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves			The Vision 2031 documents are commendable and we do not underestimate the level of commitment and professionalism that has been shown by those who have sought to create them. However, development on this scale must necessarily be viewed as part of bigger picture regional strategy and indeed, may well thus qualify for support and potential contribution from sources such as the ERDF. Local ambition is laudable but only where it retains the irreplaceable nature and culture of the historic towns and villages that exist already, together with the vibrant communities they support.	See above	No changes required
BVR15993	John Dean			The proposal of having an aspirational plan for 20 years hence is very sound and there is much in the plan to be admired. However, the plan goes too far at one bite in its ideas which will change the very nature of Bury St Edmunds. A second, but equally important failure is the piecemeal approach. It is essential in introducing such a major change to build in a programme of development stages, each to be achieved and the resulting effect considered against the final plan and the latter amended if necessary. The 2031 presentation does not do this at the moment and therefore quite rightly residents have latched on to the resulting traffic chaos that is likely to result. This of course was inevitable given that problems at the moment, recognized by the Council, have yet to be solved.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16012	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust		<p>The document does not include any reference as to how the delivery of the proposals and the effectiveness of the policies will be monitored. We would recommend that a suitable chapter identifying the necessary monitoring requirements is included within the document.</p> <p>The comments detailed in this response should be read in conjunction with those provided at the Historic and Natural Environment Vision focus group held on the 22nd March 2012.</p> <p>All documents should be updated to reflect the passing of the localism Act (2011) and the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Plans for the monitoring and assessment of the document has been added as an appendix to the document. An infrastructure delivery plan accompanies this document.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16019	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	As a general point, the document lacks recognition of the British Sugar factory as being of significant importance nationally and to Bury St Edmunds' economy, as a major enterprise and significant employer within both the town and the region. Its importance is recognised in the Council's evidence base - the Western Suffolk Employment Land Review 2009, which states that the British Sugar Factory 'plays an important role in the prosperity of the town as an employer and rate payer, as well as a user of local services'. Recognition of such significance and the importance of British Sugar's establishment in Bury St Edmunds is vital, to ensure that the Development Plan supports British Sugar's commitment to the town and that any future business needs are met without unnecessary burdens being placed on British Sugar, and to allow its operation to continue and grow.	Thank you for your comments. The impact of British Sugar Factory is recognised within the document, as well as other businesses in the area.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	<p>We therefore request that the Vision 2031 DPD recognises the factory's importance, particularly within the 'Jobs and Economy' section of Chapter 2, at Paragraph 2.7 and within Chapter 6 dealing with Jobs and Economy, as well as elsewhere in the document where relevant.</p> <p>In summary, we respectfully request that the Council recognises the significance and importance of the British Sugar factory, as a key economic and employment provider in the Borough (as well as regionally and nationally), and that this is reflected in the plan-making process. As detailed above, the preferred options presented in the consultation document do not seek to meet the business needs and growth opportunities of British Sugar.</p>	See above	See above
	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	British Sugar Plc	<p>In light of the introduction of the NPPF, the role of the LPA in the planning process in taking account of existing business needs, particularly those of the food production industry, has been emphasised. We therefore trust that the Council considers our representations in full and relative to those objections, and that this will be reflected in the next stage of the document.</p>	See above	See above

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16020	Wakako Hirose	Rapleys LLP	Frontier Key Fund	In summary, we support the Council's recognition of Frontier's aspiration and commitment to deliver this significant regeneration of the Tayfen Road, and suggest additional text to clarify the deliverability issues which are being addressed. In these terms, we welcome and support the continued allocation of the site as a mixed use development site under Policy BV9.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16023	D Munns			<p>Firstly I feel I must express my fundamental misgivings about the current approach to this country's Planning Policies and that this government like its forerunners has failed to grasp the opportunity of creating more strategically located new towns and maybe smaller village settlements possibly towards the north of the country convenient for the new railway line and employment possibilities.</p> <p>Like the immediate post-war building schemes the authorities could then organise the building of housing suitable for purchase and renting by appropriate floating populations at affordable prices. This could also have been achieved by giving employment to a vast section of the unemployed particularly the young and they in turn could have qualified for assistance in the purchase or rental of the homes so built.</p> <p>I am not convinced that in Bury there is the need or demand from local Suffolk district people for over 6000 houses.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	D Munns			<p>Surely a more measured slowly developing policy of first and foremost filling the open areas within the town's existing cartilage would have been a far better policy though I hasten to add that this should be carried out with due restraint and respect for existing dwellings and their occupants.</p> <p>I believe that the vast majority of the floating unrelated populations would have much better inspired, invigorated and served by new towns and some fascinating new villages created some even of which could have been in the more localised neighbourhoods within say 20 miles of Bury.</p> <p>I think it might be an environmental mistake for an ancient lovely country market town such as Bury to try to 'bolt on' these comparatively large new development areas. Developers I am afraid will always take the easy options and in this context this government's new planning philosophy of the face of it is somewhat scary and possibly unsafe and will need very careful consideration but which I hope it does not lead to any outrageous schemes being approved.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	D Munns			I only hope that your council will never be deterred by threat of costs in standing up to any unseemly proposals in future whether they be contained in outline or detailed submissions.	See above	No changes required
BVR16028	Ian and Caroline Baxter			<p>1 The proposed link road to the Rougham area will have no effect on the traffic problems at the Sainsbury and Orttewell Bridge areas, for people trying to reach Bury in the mornings. Have you ever been to those areas at morning and evening rush hours? Adding hundreds of extra cars will be even more unbearable.</p> <p>2 People who live in villages do like the fact that they are part of smaller communities. What is currently being proposed will inexorably lead to many villages being linked to Bury: already this is clearly proposed for Cattishall and soon after, Great Barton, also Thurston, Fornham and Westley. The development in School Road, Great Barton seems to be on a reasonable scale.</p> <p>3 The ageing population is mentioned several times: I understand there will be no bungalows on the A143 development. Will there be much affordable housing for our local young people to aspire to buying?</p> <p>4 The railway line always seemed to be a natural boundary for Bury and you are encouraging urban sprawl by going beyond it.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Infrastructure improvements and the provision of alternative transport links seek to ensure that during the duration of the plan period that adequate improvements can be made to travel within the town. The proposed strategic development site have been chosen as they are considered to be the most sustainable. This is a balanced decision based on the weighting of all the facts associated with the site, including the unique characters of existing developments and capability to provide suitable infrastructure whilst ensuring that there is adequate housing provision for a growing population. These public have been consulted on these issues throughout the creation of this vision, including extensive consultation with local parish councils and input from elected councillors.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian and Caroline Baxter			<p>5 Water is currently much discussed: supplies are inadequate already, do you think the water companies will be able to cope with vast numbers of new buildings with all the modern water requirements we now ask for?</p> <p>6 A developer may buy land speculatively but no council has to roll over and pander to their demands for planning permission. You have not polled all the people who live in the borough to ask them what they would actually like (what price democracy? We are your constituents.). Consultation meetings and proposed designs are no substitute when it comes to wrecking our environment.</p> <p>7 I remember perhaps thirty years ago hearing mention of a railway halt at Moreton Hall: will this be realised?</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR16031	Paul Lamplough			See also scanned attachment response	The comments are noted	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR16032	Charlie Bradford			<p>The plans for growth and demand for housing stated within the 2031 vision document are going to alter the landscape of Bury forever. With the volume of building in the town since 2005 and now planned towards 2031 it appears the council is calculating on large numbers of people moving into this town. Therefore is anyone in authority going to ask the following questions?:</p> <p>How can you be sure new commercial building will bring in new employment and help the needs of existing businesses in this town above another town or city?</p> <p>What evidence is there to indicate that the A14 can cope with the increases traffic levels? Heavy congestion is a serious problem on the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon.</p> <p>Are there going to be any low cost warehousing for charity organisations, for example Aid to Hospital in Bury?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The issues raised have been discussed at length. The proposed housing is based on evidence of population growth and the aspiration to ensure promote sustainable growth within the town. The Vision document does not seek to be prescriptive to the finite mix of development in the town but seeks to ensure that the best possible development is supported throughout the lifetime of the planning document. The proposed document has been subject of extensive consultation with the general public, as well as local parish councils and all relevant stakeholders.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Charlie Bradford			<p>Will there be enough quality landscaping between new and existing buildings to reduce noise and encourage some of the loss of natural habitat? Examples of existing modern is housing is everywhere along the A14 and it brings no beauty to this region, how are you going to control the developers from over development?</p> <p>The issue of an ageing population is highlighted in the plans, but is this group has housing of some type already. I see no plans for self build, mobile home parks or small bungalows in secure rental.</p> <p>What is the cost going to be for the local population? There have been some examples in the past where bad planning and poor budgeting has been wasteful.</p> <p>Why do we have to decide on so much development in one go?</p> <p>Do the majority of people know your plans?</p> <p>Would not a voting system, say online, offer better accountability?</p> <p>Received as a late response on 6 May 2012.</p>	<p>The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21134E	Richard Hobbs			No one ever wants development on their doorstep so what are public servants to do with the competing pressures placed upon them? Part of the answer is to be wary of central government imperatives which ebb and flow over time. The arguments that vast increases in the housing stock are required look to be based on assumptions which at least should be challenged and may not survive scrutiny. If more housing is not built society will evolve in a different way, for example migration will flow in a different direction. Concreting over more of Suffolk may do some good but improving or changing more of what we already have may be better.	Thank you for your comments. Housing demand has been proven to be greater than supply in the current market. If adequate housing is not provided in the locality for a growing population, including skilled workers, then the future viability of the area will be compromised.	No changes required
BVR21302E	Charles Crane			I would like to say that I think the development of the Ram Meadow site is well thought through and that I consider the orchestrated objections of the EWCA to be trumped up by the self interest of its Chairman who does not want to look at it out of his window. This is pure NIMBYism and in my opinion abuse of position. As a resident with a house adjacent to the proposed development I fully support and encourage it. It will make a huge difference to the traffic problems in Cotton Lane, Mustow Street, Eastgate Street and Northgate Street.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21306E	Mrs E Bunn			I STRONGLY disagree with the proposal to replace the grass/green area alongside Barwell Road, with MORE allotments. It not only means that us residents will be surrounded from ALL SIDES with allotments, but it is a vital and very used small area for the local children to play. Sometimes, kids that are too young to go off to the abbey gardens on their own and play. It would look like an 'allotment overload', and it is not fair on the residents to do this to their area. Allotments should be allocated at various locations across Bury, eg Morton Hall, and not JUST in this one area. Sadly I don't believe that my view will make any difference to any final decision made. I can only hope.	Thank you for your comment. There is a proven demand for allotments in the locality. The expansion of an existing site is considered to be the most appropriate method to achieve this.	No changes required
BVR21415E	Jill Burrows			Rubbish!!!! Confine it to the recycle bin where it belongs...council & developers cannot be trusted look at the mess that is the arc!!!!	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required
BVR21431E	Mrs F.R.Taylor			More thought needs to be given to the fact of the present economic problems & how it might effect the future plans.	Thank you for you comment. This issues has been considered at length. The document seeks to ensure that there is adequate flexibility for development to meet the fluctuating needs of the town over the plan period.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21510E	Ruth Brady	Bury St Edmunds Chamber of Commerce		Public Art is always contentious and those who hate it will never forgive you for spending the money. Better to use symbols of local identity - farming, brewing, WW2 etc imaginatively. Maintain open space well. Green the grey areas. What happened to the Streetscape Strategy produced in 2007? That had a plan for, among other things, sensitive and dramatic lighting schemes for iconic buildings and attractive areas.	Thank you for your comment. The provision of public art and open space is discussed within the document. The details of issues within the town centre shall be addressed in the upcoming Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21538E	Robert Houlton-Hart			Important that the Town Centre Study is undertaken as soon as possible and that there is flexibility in planning terms to cope with future changes in retailing bearing in mind the changes that have taken place in retailing patterns since the 1970s with the growth of out of town and on line shopping	Thank you for your comments. The issues for the town centre shall be addressed in the Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
BVR21596E	Anne Zarattini			local people are the life of the town .Good government is done by understanding what is important for them. Builders have to show they can build with quality and long term value.	Thank you for your comments. High quality design is an underpinning principle of current planning policy.	No changes required
BVR21607E	Mr. r h footer			scrape the whole vision 2031 bury is a lovely place to live if this plan goes ahead you will change this lovely old market town into something nobody wants only developers	Thank you for your comments. There is a proven need for development in the town. This document seeks to ensure that any new development is for the long-term benefit of the town.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21632E	Mrs M. Cooper			Please stop telling us that expansion of Bury St Edmunds is mandatory-it is not. The infrastructure cannot cope now, just stand on Rougham Road and you will see that. I fear we cannot count on the infrastructure being improved so no large scale expansion please or you will ruin this town	Thank you for your comments. There is proven need for development in the town, this document seeks to ensure that nay new development in the town meets the needs of the locality. Development will be tied to the provision of adequate infrastructure.	No changes required
BVR21641E	Richard Whalebelly			What actually changes? We have had previous consultations and made comments but nothing ever seems to change. We as the public need to be shown what this exercise actually achieves. So much of this is driven by profit and greed and not by actual need or sustainability. I also believe it has been made deliberately difficult to respond and the website is particularly confusing to know where to makes your views known. The overall document is also far too complicated and the actual starting number of 5900 which the whole document is built round is not explained where those numbers come from. Also at no point a solution to the traffic congestion problem.	Thank you for your comments. Comments made need to be weighed in the balance of all issues involved. The current document is considered to be the most appropriate means to achieve sustainable development in the town.	No changes required
BVR21650E	Mr P Watson			The aspirations are fine - but the devil is in the detail. Are the project champions really in touch with what the problems are and how the residents feel about the process?	Thank you for your comments. It is agreed that the detail of development is still subject to agreement. Any future development proposals shall be subject to formal consultation.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21655E	Carol Eagles			This questionnaire has taken several hours to complete and does not allow for a diverse range of responses.	Thank you for your comment.	No changes required
BVR21669E	Elizabeth Ellis			This document is so NOT user friendly! It's very complicated and the website link is very poor and badly designed. There have been previous consultations but it appears that comments raised have not been taken into consideration.	Thank you for your comment. The council shall endeavour to ensure that any future consultation is improved.	No changes required
BVR21673E	Mr R Wright	Bury Tyre Centre		<p>More housing and more development means more people and therefore more crime, more pollution and in general a worse quality of life.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of Bury St Edmunds will change its character from a charming provincial market town which tourists and locals enjoy visiting. It will become a place of congestion with poorer parking which will deter vital visitors.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Crime and suitable infrastructure are issues addressed within the document. The strategic development site within the document seek to ensure the long term sustainability of the town with minimal detrimental impacts on its character, whilst creating improvements wherever possible.	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21717E	John French	Sea Cadets		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Vision 2031, an interesting document which we feel could be enhanced in two areas which we feel could be usefully expanded.</p> <p>Firstly, Section 13 of the Bury St Edmunds edition (Education and Training). While this section ably demonstrates aspirations in terms of main stream education, there is no mention of the role of youth organisations and in particular those organisations such as the Sea Cadets which offer an opportunity for young people to gain nationally recognised qualifications.</p> <p>To fully review education within our town it is important to recognise the role of all youth organisations. Highly trained adult volunteers work to facilitate and support young peoples growth through dependence to interdependence, by encouraging their personal and social development and enabling them to have a voice, influence and place in their communities and wider society.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Provision of support and education for children and young adults is addressed within the document. The document remains unbiased in its approach and amendments with direct reference to the sea cadets shall not be made, as this could result in other equally important groups being excluded from the document.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	John French	Sea Cadets		<p>Youth organisations work alongside school and college based education to encourage young people to achieve and fulfil their potential as well as working with other agencies to recognise and encourage society to be responsive to the needs of young people. We rely on voluntary learning young people come to us because they want to. This often means that we are able to reach those pupils who are sometimes at odds with the rigidity of conventional education.</p> <p>Groups such as the Sea Cadets are an educational resource. It is vital that Bury St Edmunds and St Edmundsbury Borough Council recognises the wider outputs and contributions, arising from the various youth organisations, towards the development of well-balanced young individuals able to play a constructive role within local society.</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	John French	Sea Cadets		<p>To further facilitate this important work, consideration should be given to the introduction of a small development fund, similar to the now defunct Youth Opportunities Programme, previously administered by the County Council. Secondly, in Section 11, Culture and Leisure, we would like to see reference to our planned new Sea Cadet base as previously discussed with St Edmundsbury BC.</p> <p>With the growing popularity of the Sea Cadet Corps in Bury St Edmunds this new building is essential for meeting current demand and ensuring the long term viability of TS St Edmund, offering more space for training and specialised equipment - in particular our Seamanship and mechanical engineering courses.</p> <p>Depending on location, we would also envisage the use of parts of the building as a community resource available to both youth and other suitable organisations. While at an early stage, we look forward to working in partnership with St Edmundsbury BC to deliver a building which not only meets a community need but is also aesthetically reflects the character of the town.</p>	See above	No changes required
BVR21731E	Nicola Lamplough			<p>There needs to be great positive action on the road infrastructural designs and construction before any building of houses eg Taylor Wimpy / Moreton Hall</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. New development would be used to fund improvements in infrastructure.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21738E	Elizabeth Hodder			<p>You have said through your elected representatives that this Vision document is not law. It is not set in stone. You say you wish to listen to our views. You have heard a unified voice at two public meetings; we don't want this. It isn't for us. It isn't for the children of the average Bury resident who lives on the Howard or Mildenhall Road estates. You say you had to do this to prevent developers coming in and taking greenfield sites. The planning law has changed since you took that view. This over-protectionism is not necessary anymore. David Ruffley has made that clear. You seem to say that the steam roller is rolling and it can't be stopped. Oy yes it can. Please listen to the views of the man in the street before Bury gets ruined and ends up looking like Milton Keynes; just a series of roundabouts and endless housing estates. These new houses won't create jobs in Bury. These high-income earners won't work here.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. There is a proven need to provide housing and jobs for the children of the existing population of Bury, as well as provide adequate development potential to accommodate any potential future growth of the town, as necessary through the plan period. This document seeks to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on the long term viability of the town.</p>	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Elizabeth Hodder			<p>They may use local service providers like plumbers and such like; that won't hugely increase the local-spend or boost the economy. They will use our facilities - we will have to build schools to school their children. They will use our water resources. They'll pollute our roads, and cause congestion. How will the local economy benefit? Tesco/Waitrose will benefit, but that isn't the local pound in my book. That's a national firm. Will these high earners shop in Bury? If they can't park in town (the car parks will be awash), rather than queuing for ages, they may well high tail it down the A14 to Cambridge where there is adequate parking and better shopping.</p> <p>When I ask the question 'what's in in for Bury', I have to say there is a lot of hole, and not very much donut. We are not going to cement our prosperous future by this document and all these new houses. We will just be ruining what we have, for those of us who have lived here pretty much all our lives, and want it to stay pretty much as it is. Please listen to the majority!</p>	See above	No changes required

**Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company if	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
BVR21748E	Mr and Mrs G King			We have lived in Ridley Rd for 14 years. We have seen bus routes changed; number of vehicles per household increase so that more are parked on the roads than off-road; the increase of traffic through our roads despite the 'speed bumps' and the one piece of 'green land' you want to build on causing more congestion. Our green area will disappear and cannot be replaced with just planting trees! How are the two present schools going to cope with a larger pupil intake with the increased population?	Thank you for your comments. The Vision document seeks to ensure that any new development is supported by the provision of adequate infrastructure where there is a proven need.	No changes required
BVR21751E	Scott Lewis	National Grid Property Limited	Planning Perspectives LLP	National Grid Property Limited supports the retention of the current land-use allocation on the Tayfen Road site. The site is capable of being delivered within the plan period and it is important that this process continues to be encouraged through a positively framed planning policy framework.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
BVR21761E	Philip Reeve			The distinction between Bury to Rural aspirations and objectives is more exacting for those villages on the fringe of urban areas. There can be areas where compatibility between RV2031 and Bury 2031 are difficult but hopefully not contradictory.	Thank you for your comments. This issues shall continue to be given consideration.	No changes required