

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Assessment of Haverhill 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>

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	No. Change (a) from 'change people's current perception' to read 'improve significantly people's current perception'. Extend (b) to include both green routes and traffic routes. Extend (c) to include both bus and other public transport services.	The suggested change to a) suggests a very low percption at present. This is not acknowledged as accurate. b) proposes improvements to green routes as a viable alternative to traffic routes. Question what realistic additional alternative there may be in terms of public transport to reach the identified locations.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15728	Brigitte Heard							
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	Yes. However, 1.15 Neighbourhood support (as collected at the workshop in April last year) not well represented in the Vision 2031 statement. I note that in answer to question 14 and 15 on last April's workshop questionnaire I stated 'I hope that the consensus of views at the workshop will be identifiable in the actual development'. Some views have clearly been taken on board, but sadly many key views have been ignored. Equally sadly it seems that there are residents who would have liked to answer this present questionnaire but have given up as they found it too long and complicated.	It is acknowledged that some of the views expressed at the developer's workshops have not been fully implemented. This has now been addressed through the amended Concept Statement.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Barbara Surrige					Ref 2.16 and 1.42ii - viz problems of getting from the north to the south of the town, especially to get to the industrial estate, and to get to the road to Cambridge (both high priorities). These are inherent problems of a plan that insists in artificially creating a circular nucleated town when all the topography indicates a natural linear shape. Planning laws change all the time and, as I stated in the first round of consultations, if there is ever an opportunity to 'go back to the drawing board' , Carisbrooke's plan for housing south of the by- pass would address much of this problem and could achieve the aspiration of more sustainable travel to the work place		
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Paragraph b this should continue with the addition of the words "and linking country parkland extending with urban growth". The number of people with a vision of extending country parkland in Haverhill was obscured by the compilers of the report seen by the Princes Foundation. It was numerically the second highest vision of Haverhill people. However being split into 3 categories in paragraph 1.39 of the document on page 11 meant that the total figure never showed up in the report. (Lack of green space and natural environmen - need to protect country walks and extend East Town Park - more parkland in line with housing... are all the same vision of expanding country parkland).	The issues listed at paragraph 1.39 are a measure of the outcomes of the Haverhill Vision 2031 Issues and Options consultation. The work carried out by the prince's Foundation was additional to this and should be seen in conjunction, not a homogenisation of ideas.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	a) agree b) because of the terrain, the car will always be important in Haverhill and some improvements need to be made to local transport links. c) add: Progress will have been made towards restoration of the rail link. d) agree	The need to improve transport links are addressed in Chapter 7.	See proposed changes to b) above
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Heritage is not valued or preserved. Local employment opportunities are limited - not a good mix of opportunities - few professional opportunities for young people.	All of these issues are addressed in the document.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	C Rail connection between Haverhill and Addenbrookes / Cambridge should be another transportation option.	see above	
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			no	The vision statements are predicated upon earlier conclusions of the prince's Foundation assessment of Haverhill. Para. 1.39 refers to the 'lack of green spaces/natural environments, loss of/destruction of green spaces and lack of concern'. The development proposals for the north east and north west of Haverhill run counter to this statement and will accelerate the process of environmental degradation in and around the town.	Disagree. The proposed strategic growth will include green spaces and incorporate the principles of the adopted Green Infrastructure Study.	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, 1.15 Neighbourhood support (as collected at the workshop in April last year) not well represented in the Vision 2031 statement. I note that in answer to question 14 and 15 on last April's workshop questionnaire I stated 'I hope that the consensus of views at the workshop will be identifiable in the actual development'. Some views have clearly been taken on board, but sadly many key views have been ignored. Equally sadly it seems that there are residents who would have liked to answer this present questionnaire but have given up as they found it too long and complicated.	Comments are noted and specific issues addressed in the context of the strategic development to NE Haverhill.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents				Ref 2.16 and 1.42ii - viz problems of getting from the north to the south of the town, especially to get to the industrial estate, and to get to the road to Cambridge (both high priorities). These are inherent problems of a plan that insists in artificially creating a circular nucleated town when all the topography indicates a natural linear shape. Planning laws change all the time and, as I stated in the first round of consultations, if there is ever an opportunity to 'go back to the drawing board', Carisbrooke's plan for housing south of the bypass would address much of this problem and could achieve the aspiration of more sustainable travel to the work place		See action identified in response to HVR15722

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). The Princes Vision statements broadly underpin the expansion plans for Haverhill and the Borough as a whole, which we opposes as laid out in our responses in this questionnaire. 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.	Noted	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council has no comment to make on the Prince's Foundation vision statements for the town.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR20999E	Chad				no	c) High speed bus Haverhill needs to be connected to the rail network . as it is cleaner / safer / 21st century /cuts down congestion / better for business. and it is a MUST for the towns vision to be a success for the future.	Noted. All forms of public transport need to be considered which can access all desired destinations. Whereas a rail link may be desirable and its feasibility should continue to be explored. However, it may not provide the flexibility of routes and destinations offered by other modes of transport.	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Extend (b) to include both green and traffic routes-Extend (c) to include both bus and other transport services.	b) proposes improvements to green routes as a viable alternative to traffic routes. Question what realistic additional alternative there may be in terms of public transport to reach the identified locations.	
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	The lack of national retailers should not be a negative aspect - in fact arguably should be positive as the encouragement of independent retailers should be made. However there is no justification for a town centre in a modern age of internet shopping. What should be done is to encourage people to shop online, remove traffic from the roads, remove need for more car parks and generally tidy up what is there already.	The lack of national retailers has been identified by residents as a negative aspect which causes them to use shopping centres elsewhere. A lack of local retailers could be similarly viewed as negative, with a lack of local identity. A balance is required. Despite the increase in on-line retailing, town centres still have an important role to play not just in terms of retail provision, but social, cultural, community and residential. This is recognised in the NPPF.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Local peoples views or needs are not taken into consideration - you ask views and opinions and then ignore them.	This is an unfortunate opinion which is not borne out by evidence. See responses to other constructive representations.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	<p>1.15 Neighbourhood support (as collected at the workshop in April last year) not well represented in the Vision 2031 statement.</p> <p>1.43 (c). We question how realistic this is since other councils have not indicated their desire to achieve this. These links are of utmost importance to the economic prospects of Haverhill.</p> <p>1.43 (d). Since Cambridge is greatly expanding its own research, manufacturing and retail and housing facilities we question why Haverhill will be such a desirable support hub.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and specific issues addressed in the context of the strategic development to NE Haverhill. Acknowledge the challenge in achieving c). Opportunities within Cambridge for business growth are limited and Haverhill has been identified as one of a number of towns which is well placed to respond to this demand.</p>	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	<p>No hard evidence on need for the extent of housing proposed in Haverhill.</p> <p>I notice that Kedington Parish Council does not appear on the published list of consultees for the Haverhill Action Plan, yet organisations as far as Cambridgeshire and Essex were. Since the proposed development spills onto land which is in the Parish of Kedington, this would have been appropriate.</p> <p>Presumably it was the consultees who were invited to the original feedback session [1.42] that was held at the end of the assessment of the output from the Princes Foundation Trust Community Capital Framework work which then were used to inform the objectives and visions of Haverhill. Who was in this group & why does this supersede local views?</p> <p>Why was this new tool introduced and used to over ride the consultation feedback from the official consultation with the people of Haverhill which ended on 1st April. Is this a joke?!</p> <p>1</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 Prince's Trust work involved local people and forms just one element of the consultation and does not over ride any other consultation feedback.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>Action plan needs to be based on more than a hunch if it is to be used to justify 5000 new homes, many to be built on Greenfield land outside the development boundary and in a town without jobs to support them.</p> <p>Action plan should be more about regeneration of the Town than of extending it. Previous economic development and regeneration proposals indicated that neighbourhood renewal funding would be concentrated on the most deprived areas. In order to meet the needs of the people of Haverhill, I suggest that the Haverhill action plan should also concentrate on this, first.</p> <p>The landowners masterplan for NE is a reasonable one, assuming that the plan is justified on the basis of realistic local needs however all projections do make this very big assumption, and the plan misses the opportunity to add an amenity green recreational space to tackle inequality and to improve health closest to housing HV4b which will be lacking when new development goes ahead leaving existing residents without amenity land close by.</p>	<p>The Haverhill Vision 2031 is a comprehensive document which addresses wide range of issues for Haverhill over the next 20 years, not just housing growth. Regeneration of areas is potentially an ongoing process, but this will not address provision of jobs, homes and services for the growing population.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>We have not seen much evidence of the need for housing in Haverhill to support jobs in Haverhill. The jobs/housing imbalance is excessive and there clearly need to be efforts to address that before further population expansion. The High Tech employment site proposed at the Cambridge side of town will help but not necessarily generate significant number of jobs for local people.</p> <p>The significant and rapid over supply of housing with the significant under supply of jobs and continued decline in the manufacturing sector, has forced occupants of the town and wider area to travel further to work. This has caused significant inequality in the job market for all who are deprived and not able to operate their own car.</p> <p>Bury accounts for 64% of boroughs jobs, Haverhill only 17% of which manufacturing forms the biggest sector (in decline), so over expanding the Haverhill area any greater than this ratio will force the population of Haverhill to continue to travel further for work on its fatally dangerous trunk road network.</p>	<p>People will continue to choose Haverhill 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. This includes broadening the range of employment opportunities, encouraging retail, service and research sectors in addition to the traditional employment sectore.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>Transport is responsible for a large proportion of carbon emissions This development therefore conflicts with National Policy Guidance on Transport because it does not reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs. A1307 is not safe (deaths every year 10 years on stretch from Haverhill to Cambridge). Cambridge is not close or easy to access, particularly by bus. Despite the emphasis given to encouraging sustainable transport movements, it is not expected that most commuters will do so by any other method than by car so the road link to Cambridge needs to be made safe and not just slower.</p>	<p>The Vision document seeks to redress the jobs/homes balance by the creation of a wider range of job types. We are seeking to improve bus services to make it a viable and realistic alternative.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>During the environmental impact assessment of the Core Strategy, the transport assessment only looked at distances travelled by St Edmundsbury occupants to work where their destinations of travel fell within the borough of St Edmundsbury. This is a significant failure. Some of the statistics given, which are well out of date also seem dubious. The joint development DMP Sustainability Appraisal states available data suggests that the distance that residents commute to work is significantly higher than the national mean.</p> <p>Haverhill Action plan should address this by commissioning an up to date transport assessment to determine the workplace destinations of the working Haverhill population to evaluate the likely detrimental environmental impact caused by significant levels of additional out commuters from housing in Haverhill. The St Edmundsbury LDF Haverhill Transport Impacts Assessment is based on out of date statistics from 2001 and we have seen how the working patterns of the local economy can change in 10 years.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment looked at where residents of Haverhill travelled to work. Given that this plan is for Haverhill, it is a reasonable approach to take. Planning cannot control where people work, it can only influence travel patterns by creating a better balance of homes, jobs and services.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>This then needs to be reviewed by the same planning inspector who evaluated the Core Strategy and cross checked for soundness.</p> <p>For those who have jobs, the amount of time spent commuting to work has effected their quality family and leisure time and has contributed to the relatively poor health of the local population. Any further development of housing in Haverhill will increase the economic, health and wellbeing problems of Haverhill residents unless the number of jobs are first increased to meet the current demand for jobs of the population. Houses should only be increased in Haverhill when the economic assessment can justify the need for such houses in the town and area. Yes, the Haverhill Vision adds to employment land, however, this is required even without new housing.</p>	Haverhill Research Park is being developed now. Land is available, but companies will not move to a town without homes for employees.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>Regarding the ring road, if there was insufficient evidence to now support this need, why was it offered as a strategic objective? The Core Strategy Policy Growth for Haverhill CS12 stated that the northeast site will need to deliver a north-east relief road for Haverhill between the A134 and the A1017 and the local distributor road network and this was based on the SEBC LDF Transport Impacts report for Haverhill. The reason that the ring road is important is that it would act as a final undisputable buffer zone (on the Haverhill side of the ridge) to prevent further outward creep of the town because we know that natural buffer zones can be moved over time.</p> <p>Are other strategic objectives based upon similar insufficient evidence to support the needs?</p>	The Core Strategy and Policy CS12 do not require the delivery of a north-east relief road. The issue was considered fully during the examination in public for the Core Strategy in 2010. There was no evidence to support the need then and the situation has not changed.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>We have heard a lot about the proximity to Cambridge. The Cambridge Sub Region Study or the Buchanan Report was a major study which looked at the capacity and impacts of development options and was used by SEBC during previous Haverhill Vision exercises in terms of sustainability criteria and implementation. Although the regional spatial strategies may have now been dropped, the underlying sustainability research and recommendations should still be valid. I understand that the Buchanan report recommended that in order to maintain its rural integrity, settlements should have a clear separation distance from an encroaching town.</p> <p>In order to protect the Hamlet of Calford Green from coalescence a landscape character assessment should be made of the area between the existing settlement boundary of Haverhill and the settlement of Calford Green, which can then be used to ensure it maintains its distinctive identity.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>Due to the sequential approach to development, the town centre masterplan should be implemented before any building takes place on Greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Urban Capacity Study which identified the need for development which underpinned the previous development plan was based on research carried out in 2001 and, therefore, is no longer valid. Since this is at the heart of the approach, this research should be renewed if it is to provide robust justification to underpin the Haverhill Vision.</p> <p>The LDF Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan states to meet this requirement, independent consultants were appointed to undertake an Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) in mid 2008. However, this document was purely a projection about the likely infrastructure that might be required to support housing growth and does not relate to Urban Capacity for dwellings.</p>	<p>There is no justifiable reason why the town centre masterplan should take precedence over the provision of homes. Agree that the Urban Capacity Study is out of date. It has been superceded by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which is regularly updated and published and identifies limited opportunities.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>I notice plans to remove the Urban Edge because apparently there is no policy for this. However, there is a planning policy and guidance for development it is called a settlement boundary. An area action plan should plan for development within that area. I think that the Core Strategy misled people because it was not made clear at the time that the proposed development in North East of Haverhill would be so far outside the development boundary. Maps have failed to show the existing settlement boundary so peoples comments would have been shaped on the basis that this land was within Haverhill. No information on the exact location of development were available at the time of the Core Strategy consultation despite references that were made to an attached Plan which were missing. Leaving this ambiguity until the Haverhill Action plan at which point commitments appear to have already been made, is inadequate if this is a key objective. For a key objective to be so, it must be clear and obvious.</p>	<p>The process of preparing LDF documents and in particular, a Core Strategy did not permit definition of sites. Such sites would be defined by a more in depth process of producing Area Action Plans, which is what has been achieved through the Haverhill Vision 2031 document.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 1: Prince's foundation Vision Statements

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	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
	Nathan Loader					<p>The Haverhill Action plan should ensure that through design, the housing identified can be fitted within the land available inside the settlement boundary. Since the highest demand for housing is going to be low cost housing for increasing numbers of young, increasingly deprived and unemployed perhaps higher density housing may be the most sustainable and economically viable. The second largest need for housing is going to be for the ageing population who will need sheltered accommodation and care homes. This too could be relatively high density and carefully designed for community cohesion. Since the North West site is going to come first, perhaps this should be implemented first and if this approach is combined with utilizing brownfield town centre sites suitable for regenerating the town, then it may well be possible that the levels of decent homing for the needs of Haverhill could be met without the North East needing to breach the perimeter.</p>	<p>The Vision document provides for a range of housing to serve all tenures and types. Although housing will be an important element, there are few opportunities in the town centre for housing, if the town is also to be an attractive shopping and leisure destination.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The challenges identified are supposed to guide the overall direction of future service provision and investment. It is unclear whether all the identified challenges can achieve this. As an example, the character and image of a town is a subjective matter. Whilst many of the responses to the consultation identified issues that might be addressed through planning (e.g. need for better facilities, additional range of retailers, etc), character and image may not, depending upon the viewer. A resident of (say) Kersey may have a very different view that is diametrically opposed to the historic and picturesque view of the visitors that go there each year. There is no evidence presented to support the view that the image and character need to change - whilst other factors that can affect future inward investment (poor road links, lack of rail links, poor infrastructure (fresh water supplies, north-south road links) have been presented. The town centre, challenge (b), being old-fashioned, is not in itself a failing.	Whilst these issues may be subjective, many of the perceptions have been informed by previous consultation feedback. An old fashioned town centre in itself is not failing, but a town centre which people avoid is. There is no single problem or solution and there are positive elements which could be built upon. It is acknowledged that the town centre is too large and important an issue to be adequately covered by this document, which is why Chapter 15 proposes a Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				Other towns (Woodbridge for example) thrive on their old-fashioned High Streets. However evidence exists that demonstrates that the size of available premises is not representative of the sizes being sought by retailers. Smaller-size shops are attractive (reference the take-up and continued occupancy of the four High Street shops outside the main shopping area) as are larger-size shops (as evidenced by the Iceland takeover of the former Woolworths store). Challenge (c) compresses the problem of inadequate health care facilities with employment needs and concludes that this is less of a problem for Haverhill. Haverhill's issues are thus the fact that its large-scale expansion in the 1960's was not echoed by a corresponding expansion in facilities for the elderly. Thus, as these 'newcomers' reach retirement age there is a pressing and immediate need to create these local facilities from a low starting point, unlike other towns where growth has been steady.	Although the issues arising from an ageing population are currently less of a problem in Haverhill than elsewhere, they are not being disregarded. The document is identifying that this is an issue which needs to be addressed. Broadband provision is highlighted as a particular issue, but other infrastructure requirements are covered in Chapter 10. There is no inference that crime and antisocial behaviour is ascribed to young people. What is suggested is that working with young people would be a starting point.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				This also has an impact on employment, as Haverhill has a disproportionate percentage of persons under-65 seeking employment, meaning that the growth of employment also needs addressing as a priority. We should separate the health facilities challenge and identify as a pressing challenge. Is Broadband the only service utility that may impinge on future growth ? We know that the sewage works has capacity for a population in the region of 35,000, but what about fresh water supply, electricity/gas supply, or the capacity of existing in-town distribution systems to cope with growth ? Challenges (e) and (f) are the same issue. In identifying key issues we should avoid proposing solutions without more detailed consultation. Whilst the research indicates a concern amongst residents regarding future employment, which is probably reflected in Haverhill's skewed population requiring growth in the employment sector, the remainder of challenge (g) is not evidenced on the ground. There are substantial links between employment and our two upper schools.		
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				The issue is much more about employment opportunities - whilst R&D employers will support high skill employment we also need to accept that employment trends are towards retail and service sector opportunities. Haverhill is well placed to expand that sector. Challenge (h) ascribes crime and ASB to young people, by inference. Whilst there is evidence of this as a perception there is little evidence of this as fact. Citizenship education is well established in both our upper schools; education in citizenship is a long term strategy - it is too early to condemn current progress and bridging that education to the community is the current requirement (as the proposed Youth Town Council is endeavouring to achieve).		
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	However, in 3.1 bullet 4 'villages' should be changed to 'settlements' , or to 'villages and hamlet'. Calford Green is a hamlet and needs critical consideration in respect of the NE plan and so must be identified in this para.	Although reference to villages already includes hamlets, for the avoidance of doubt hamlets can be included in the wording.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Paragraph 2a has missed out the need for a country park which will increase the attractiveness of the town, and benefits all its residents.	Open space provision is addressed in Objective 5, Chapter 11 (culture and leisure) and Chapter 16 (strategic growth areas).	See comments in respect of Chapter 16
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Calford Green needs to be considered critically as this character should not be merged or lost	This is acknowledged and is a stated aim of the adopted Core Strategy	No changes required to this section. See changes to Strategic Growth Concept Statement.
HVR15857	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd				
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	Yes but d) should point out that BT does not at present intend to upgrade Haverhill businesses with the new faster broadband link.	Thank you for the information.	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	The key cross-subject challenge for villages such as Sturmer is set out in para 3.1 which must include identity and integrity and the prevention of coalescence into neighbouring urban areas.	This support is welcomed. The observations relating to 3.1 are noted. This is already acknowledged by the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, in 3.1 bullet 4 'villages' should be changed to 'settlements' , or to 'villages and hamlet'. Calford Green is a hamlet and needs critical consideration in respect of the NE plan and so must be identified in this para.	Although reference to villages already includes hamlets, for the avoidance of doubt hamlets can be included in the wording.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment			no	Whilst the county council would not dispute the significance of the cross-cutting challenges for Haverhill, we would suggest that climate change should be included. This is one of the biggest challenges facing us both globally and locally, and should be recognised in this section. Although the Prince's Foundation vision identified transport issues as a key negative area, this has not been covered in the key challenges detailed here.	This is acknowledged, but is not a specific challenge relating to Haverhill. However, it is addressed in the Haverhill context in section 8	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	Generally the statements made are correct. Again the lack of a town centre should not be seen as a major detriment other than the massive amount of take aways, charity shops, and "beauty" places.	The lack of national retailers has been identified by residents as a negative aspect which causes them to use shopping centres elsewhere.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Additional housing (council tax revenue) is more of a priority for the council over jobs, education, transports, public services, greenbelt land or local peoples needs. We currently have no school places available for 5 year olds, poor transport and large brown field sites with no current plans (the derelict vandalised middle schools)	Disagree. The document seeks to address all aspects which affect the quality of life, not just the provision of housing.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	in 3.1 bullet 4 villages should be changed to settlements, or to villages and hamlet. Calford Green is a hamlet and needs critical consideration in respect of the NE plan and so must be identified in this paragraph. In addition we question whether these proposals really do protect the identity and integrity of the surrounding villages, settlements and hamlets.	Although reference to villages already includes hamlets, for the avoidance of doubt hamlets can be included in the wording.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'
HVR21740E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row						
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	I would also highlight addressing existing health inequalities as a challenge - this is pointed out as an issue in 2.27	This support is welcomed. The observations relating to 2.27 are noted.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 2: Cross-subject challenges

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenge for the town?	Question 2b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	See above answer to Q1. Bring more jobs to Haverhill & housing requirement is nearer to Cambridge	The document does include provision for growth in employment to meet the demand of the town. The location of housing has been determined by the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no	Rather than build even more properties in the town we feel you need to provide the correct facilities for what the town already has.	There is a legal requirement to meet the housing needs in Haverhill. However, this is just one of 9 objectives which seek to address existing issues.	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Noted	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Objective 4 should include 'shopping and cultural needs and aspirations'. It is counter-intuitive to separate these elements of consumption. There should be an additional objective, or Objective 5 should be extended, to reflect concerns that 'in-fill' developments are compromising the character of neighbourhoods. Objective 5 should also contain reference to the need to increase the green spaces and countryside available for residents to access. Haverhill is already outside the suggested travel distances to a large-scale countryside facility (East Town Park does not meet the national criteria for such) and reference needs to be made to the future establishment of such a facility close to Haverhill. In addition there is no reference to the need to protect biodiversity, geodiversity or the natural environment when planning new development.	Agree that Objective 4 should be expanded to include cultural needs. There is no evidence that infill developments are compromising the character of neighbourhoods. However, policies within the Development Management Document do address this issue. The reference to green space refers to all forms of green space and does not preclude parkland. The Green Infrastructure Study referred to in Chapter 14 includes opportunities for new parkland. The need for protection of biodiversity, geodiversity and the natural environment are dealt with in detail in policies contained within the Development Management Document.	Amend Objective 4 to read 'To meet the shopping and cultural needs of residents....'
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no	Yes; however the town centre policies to many residents are not satisfactory, i.e. lack of diversity with shops, road and pedestrian system inadequate. A priority to improve the image of Haverhill.	Noted. It is acknowledged that the town centre is too large and important an issue to be adequately covered by this document, which is why Chapter 15 proposes a Town Centre Masterplan.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	However, Objective 6 (unsustainable travel to town centre) - building in close proximity to Calford Green, as shown in the document, would not meet this requirement. This point is proved on maps on page 33 and 34 (walking distances to town centre, and distances from local centres).	This support is welcomed. This is an issue which needs to be addressed in the consideration of the strategic growth to the North East of Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Objective 5 the words "green space" are inadequate, parcels of green space are desirable but are not an attraction to keep people in the town. They would need to go elsewhere to visit country parkland. Objective 5 should read "green space and country parkland".	The reference to green space refers to all forms of green space and does not preclude parkland. The Green Infrastructure Study referred to in Chapter 14 includes opportunities for new parkland.	No changes required
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes	Objective 10 should be more aspirational and refer to high quality schools...	This aspiration is included within section 13 of the document.	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Much of the proposed land is too far away	Assuming that this relates to the provision of residential land it may be an issue for consideration relating to the strategic growth.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	Yes to above to ensure that residents have easy and convenient transport links with major counties of population such as Cambridge and London.	Noted.	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I do not think it is necessary to have higher educational facilities in Haverhill. Vocational and technical training would be better. Additional objective: ensure health provision matches population.	Objective 9 includes vocational training. There is no reason to remove higher education.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no	Objective 1 Haverhill still has a relatively young population, as recognised in the text within the Haverhill Vision 2031 document (page 20), and although it is acknowledged that over the plan period the structure of the population in Haverhill will alter, it is not considered that specific reference to appropriate housing for an ageing population should be included within Objective 1, while there is no reference to matters such as sustainability and the continuous supply of land for housing. Both these matters are contained within Strategic Objective A in the adopted Core Strategy and while not wishing to duplicate policies, it is considered that reference should be made to them in Objective 1 of the Haverhill Vision 2031 document particularly given the emphasis on both in the recently published NPPF.	The reference on page 20 identifies that despite having a younger population, the ageing population still remains an issue. Objective 1 does require a supply of housing land, but sustainability matters are addressed in Objective 8.	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes Strongly Agree - Nice and practical objectives set.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes	Objective 9 could / should be broadened: to ensure residents have access to schools..., leisure, cultural and community facilities.	Cultural provision can be incorporated in Objective 4. Leisure and community are already included in the Core Strategy objectives.	Amend Objective 4 to read 'To meet the shopping and cultural needs of residents...'
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15932	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				We are in agreement that the draft objectives for the Haverhill Vision 2031 relate with the Strategic Spatial Objectives set out in the Core Strategy. We are particularly supportive of objectives 5 and 8.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, Objective 6 (unsustainable travel to town centre) building in close proximity to Calford Green, as shown in the document, would not meet this requirement. This point is proved on maps on page 33 and 34 (walking distances to town centre, and distances from local centres).	This is an issue which needs to be addressed in the consideration of the strategic growth to the North East of Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	The policy does not offer any change to the Core Strategy's proposals for growth. The Core Strategy must be re-visited and housing numbers modified. House numbers must be agreed with local residents as part of any neighbourhood plan. It must also be linked to the Visions for Bury and Rural Areas.	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.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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	<p>This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document)</p> <p>A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council welcomes these objectives, particularly the references to the ageing population, countryside access, sustainable transport and climate change. 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 the rural areas, if that is not to close to the existing Core Strategy objective. Objective 6 might be improved by including reference to employment locations, alongside the existing settlement and other services and facilities, as employment land wouldn't generally be seen as a service or facility. Objective 9, 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 word 'environmental' inserted for clarity.	Agree that objective 6 should include employment locations and accept that inclusion of specific considerations could be read to exclude others.	Amend Objective 6 to include employment locations. Amend Objective 8 to refer to environmental sustainability considerations without listing examples.
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	No	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	There is no requirement for the massive increase in housing development that could not be solved by restricting immigration and the general open market we allow to foreign persons. The Vision statement is based on a previous government's plans and the EEDA say so. As both are now defunct then the whole Vision statement should be re-examined. The town should be allowed to remain roughly at the size it is particularly as nowhere in the Vision document does it state how the extra people will be employed. And how can large tracts of, what is healthy, agricultural land be handed over for development is beyond me when we cannot even feed the people we have now.	This observation fails to recognise the true pressure and need for growth.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Bindley				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		Noted	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Why do we have to build houses to support London and eastern Europe?	This observation fails to recognise the true pressure and need for growth.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 3: Draft Objectives

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for Haverhill?	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
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	Objective 5. We do not believe that the natural and built up character, identity, and local distinctiveness of Haverhill is not compromised by Vision 2031. It would seem that the most desirable environmental aspects of dwelling in Haverhill - the access to beautiful countryside - will be diminished by this strategy. Objective 6 (unsustainable travel to town centre) - building in close proximity to Calford Green, as shown in the document, would not meet this requirement. This point is proved on maps on page 33 and 34 (walking distances to town centre, and distances from local centres).	These representations would appear to relate to the strategic growth area to the north east of Haverhill, rather than the objectives themselves. However, the concerns raised do need to be addressed in the relevant sections of the document.	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	To ensure that proposals consider the impact on health inequalities.; new developments create an environment that promotes healthy/active lifestyle.	Noted	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	An assessment of need for housing in Haverhill	An assessment of the need for housing in Haverhill was carried out as part of the Core Strategy.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (HV1)

Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy HV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Should include 'subject to infrastructure contributions where appropriate'.	Infrastructure requirements are already addressed by Policy CS12 in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
Basil Rowley				no	The concentration of housing is too intense. Natural open spaces need more sympathetic consideration, wildlife resent being driven from it adopted habitat.	There is a balance to be struck between the intensity of housing and the extent of housing. Density directives have now been removed and the nature of growth is addressed by policies contained within the draft Development Management Policies document.	No changes required
John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Barbara Surrige				Yes	in 3.1 bullet 4 'villages' should be changed to 'settlements' , or to 'villages and hamlet'. Calford Green is a hamlet and needs critical consideration in respect of the NE plan and so must be identified in this para.	This is the same issue raised in response to question 2.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'
Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Calford Green needs to be considered critically as this character should not be merged or lost	It is agreed that the character of Calford Green should be protected.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'
Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd				
Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (HV1)

Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy HV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Mrs A Wilson				no	I would like all the brownfield sites to be considered for development before greenfield sites. I am concerned that new homes will be built and occupied by people from outside our town, making it a dormitory town.	Brownfield sites do take precedence over greenfield sites. However, there are insufficient such sites to meet the needs for Haverhill and there are constraints to development which prevent some sites coming forward at an early stage. We cannot control who buys property in the town, but the Vision does provide opportunities for employment and service growth to help mitigate this issue.	No changes required
Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes - I believe Chalkstone and Millfields Way should be a priority within the Housing Development Plan.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs Marty House				no	No opinion Add: where it is not contrary to other planning policies and does not create unacceptable levels of traffic on existing roads.	This issue is addressed by policies contained within the draft Development Management Policies document.	No changes required
Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no	in 3.1 bullet 4 'villages' should be changed to 'settlements', or to 'villages and hamlet'. Calford Green is a hamlet and needs critical consideration in respect of the NE plan and so must be identified in this para.	This is the same issue raised in response to question 2.	Amend bullet 4 in paragraph 3.1 to read 'protect the identity and integrity of surrounding villages and hamlets'

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (HV1)

Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy HV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made 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 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the general expansion of the Borough and its promotion as a growth area. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings across the Borough as a whole, to more moderate levels. The Core Strategy should be revisited and the expansion plans changed to accord with residents' views across the Borough. There is no legal obligation to continue with the housing targets imposed by the East of England Regional Authority. Any new housing must include a mixed density and include , not only affordable and intermediate housing, but larger properties with decent sized plots and front and rear gardens.	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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (HV1)

Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy HV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council has no comment to make on this policy at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no	Have more executive housing.	The nature and form of new housing is subject to policies contained within the draft Development Management Policies Document. The strategic growth development identified in chapter 16 does promote executive housing (paragraph 16.6)	No changes required
Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Patrick Hanlon				no	Should include executive housing.	The nature and form of new housing is subject to policies contained within the draft Development Management Policies Document. The strategic growth development identified in chapter 16 does promote executive housing (paragraph 16.6)	No changes required
C M Mascot				no	towns and villages should not merge	This is already a strategic aim within Policy CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.	None
Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	Opposed to planning for 25 houses on the former Castle Hill school site. Road access to an already dangerously busy road. Already using unallocated spaces as congestion is so bad.	This site is addressed in response to Question 8.	See changes proposed under Question 8.
John Burns				no	No further house building on green or agricultural land.	Brownfield sites do take precedence over greenfield sites. However, there are insufficient such sites to meet the needs for Haverhill and there are constraints to development which prevent some sites coming forward at an early stage. It is, therefore, essential that some green or agricultural land comes forward for development.	No changes required
Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 4: Housing Development (HV1)

Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with Policy HV1?	Question 4b - If not, what changes would you like to be made and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Jason				no	Where are the plans for improvements for the roads and transport from Cambridge, Bury and Sudbury?	This is addressed in Section 7.	No changes required
Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row						
Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
Nathan Loader				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Haverhill (HV2)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with Policy HV2?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15777	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.	Noted	No changes required
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I feel that this area is too large for an integrated development It will be more like a new village. I would like to see this scaled down and for all existing woodland and hedgerows to be maintained.	The adopted masterplan for this area acknowledges the challenge of integrating this development into the town and avoiding a new village scenario. It also identifies and retains existing woodland and hedgerow and proposes significant new planting and open space.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Haverhill (HV2)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with Policy HV2?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15892	David Henry	Savills	Consortium of North West Haverhill Landowners		yes	The landowners are supportive and agree in principle with Policy HE2. As you are aware, the Borough Council and the landowners are working collaboratively towards delivering this important strategic development including the determination of the current planning application (as referred to in paragraph 5.12 of the document) at the earliest opportunity. Indeed, the delivery of the North West Haverhill Development is, in our opinion, pre-requisite of ensuring the soundness of the vision strategy overall. Early delivery is an important part of satisfying policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, including the land at the North West and North East Haverhill and the strategy for the town generally.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion	Cannot understand map	The map is a reduced map taken from the adopted masterplan. The scale of reproduction and lack of a key do make it difficult to read.	Provide clearer map, or remove altogether.
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the general expansion of the Borough and its promotion as a growth area. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings across the Borough as a whole, to more moderate levels. The Core Strategy should be revisited and the expansion plans to the Borough changed to accord with residents' views. There is no legal obligation to continue with the housing targets imposed by the East of England Regional Authority. Any development of this site should meet the approval of the local residents, including the final number of dwellings to be built.	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

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Haverhill (HV2)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with Policy HV2?	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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16013	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				It should be ensured that the implementation of this policy accords with the measures identified within the adopted Masterplan to protect the Ann Suckling's Way County Wildlife Site (CWS).	Noted	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council does not object to this allocation in principle, and will continue to work with St Edmundsbury and the developer to ensure that infrastructure provision for this new development is sufficient.	Noted	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	I would question the need for local shop(s) at both planned sites. Surely we need to make access to the town easy, so as to use these outlets more.	The purpose of the shops is to meet the day to day requirements of neighbourhoods, not to compete with the town centre.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 5: North-west Haverhill (HV2)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with Policy HV2?	Question 5b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	No further house building on green or agricultural land.	This is an existing allocation being carried forward. This comment does not justify why the allocation should be withdrawn.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Why build on more greenbelt?	This is not greenbelt	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15708	Mr L F & Mrs M D Basire				no	<p>We were pleased to learn that the wooded area behind our property is not going to be destroyed, and that the proposed building are going to be the other side of that wooded area and out of our view. ALthough we do have concerns about the possible disruption and noise that will be casued by the contractors.</p> <p>We are not happy about cycle tracks being put in especially if it means the wooded area being destroyed. There is a large number of wildlife and birds in this area and it seems that some of this would be lost with the proposed cycle tracks. We would, therefore, like to have your written confirmation that this wooded area is not going to be destroyed and is going to be left as it is now.</p> <p>We also have a concern about the proposed access road to allow vehicles onto Chalkstone Way from the new estate. Chalkstone Way is bad enough as it is with cars parked and the volume of traffic, especially as a bus route and when cars are parked by the school. We can only see this problem escalating due to the extra volume of traffic.</p>	At this stage of the process, it is the principles which will inform the nature and form of development to take place, which are being established. Matters of detail such as the precise location of footpaths and cycleways will be considered at the masterplan stage and in the consideration of planning applications. Principles such as the retention of woodlands and tree belts and the position of new strategic planting and open space are being addressed at this stage. Not all traffic will use Chalkstone Way as alternative access points will also be required, but a detailed traffic assessment will be required. The shops and businesses proposed are those intended to serve the development and day to day needs of the immediate community. They are not intended to compete with the town centre.	No changes required to boundary, although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development. See separate changes to Concept Plan.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr L F & Mrs M D Basire					<p>Not sure what sort of shops or businesses are being proposed. The town is losing shops at an alarming rate as it is and if you are proposing new shopping developments on the proposed site, that shops that are left in the town will obviously be put out of business. We are also worried about the increased volume of traffic and parking facilities. We can envisage that people will park in Chalkstone Way or Shetland Road and cut through.</p> <p>When we first moved into our property we were assured that the land behind our property would never be built on as it is farm land. What has now changed to make this land available for development?</p>	<p>No assurance can ever be given that land will not be developed. Such assurances can only ever be short term and relate to the time frame of existing adopted development plans. However, these are reviewed on a regular basis and have to be adapted to meet current and future needs. The existing Core Strategy, which identifies this land for development was adopted in 2010 and covers the time period up to 2031.</p>	<p>No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.</p>
	Mr L F & Mrs M D Basire					<p>As you can gather from this letter, we are writing to confirm our objections to the whole development taking place and we would like the contents letter recorded and our objections made known to the appropriate planners that we are not happy with any development taking place now or in the future. We would appreciate confirmation of not only the receipt of this correspondence but also written confirmation concerning the wooded area not being destroyed.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The inclusion of Great Wilsey Farm appears arbitrary. Is there some reason for this? The outer boundaries of this site, if developed, will have considerable impact on the aspects of residents living in Kedington and Calford Green. Earlier proposals, accepted in principle by both Haverhill Town Council and Kedington Parish Council, limited the development area to south of the stream that runs (roughly) west to east. Even then some form of early screening would need to be provided to the north west of the development area to protect Calford Green. If this means the site is thus unable to support the 2,000 proposed dwellings then alternative sites may need to be provided.	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed are contained in the Concept Plan in Chapter 16. Although these site boudaries are influenced by land ownership, the details contained within the concept plan are based upon analysis of landform and impact upon adjacent settlement. Changes are required to the draft the concept plan as detailed in chapter 16.	No changes required to boundary although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development. See separate changes to Concept Plan.
HVR15723	Margaret Chapman				no	This will destroy an area of natural beauty and the road system cannot sustain the extra traffic - it's very dangerous now	Development will undoubtedly change the character of an area of arable land. Traffic assessments will be required and changes made to the present highway arrangements, but there is capacity.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				no	Further discussed in answer 35		
HVR15777	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology			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). We object to the principle of development within the vicinity of Great Wilsey Farm that would detrimentally affect the setting of a Scheduled Monument (DSF 33287).	These matters will need to be taken into account in the preparation of the masterplan. Further discussions will be required. Any development in the vicinity of Great Wilsey Farm will have to take account of the setting of the Scheduled monument.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	The woodland area to the south west of the development site should be preserved intact and be excluded from the development area. There should be no urban development or housing in the triangle between Wilsey Estate, Calford Green and Coupals Road to enable East Town Park to be extended. No estate roads should have access to Coupals Road because it is both dangerous and would bisect the proposed parkland area.	Agree that the woodland area should be protected from development, but this does not mean that it should be excluded from the development area. The development area includes built development and open space including strategic landscaping and open areas. Amendments to the Concept Plan address some of the issues raised.	A distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	<p>North east Haverhill make little sense to develop for many reasons;</p> <p>1. It is the wrong side of Haverhill for local jobs. The focus for present and future jobs locally are the industrial estates and science park to the west. This will result in added journey times, more pollution, more congestion, not a satisfactory life for newcomers (therefore another town will be preferred to live in).</p> <p>2. This is the wrong side of town for further away jobs and recreation. The fact that we have Cambridge City and enormous Science Park to the west of us will not go away. Of course we need to encourage businesses to our town, but the draw of Cambridge will still be there and will be many peoples' preferred destination. This is historical and factual.</p>	The principle of developing this area of land was established by the adoption of the Core Strategy on 2010, when these arguments were considered in detail. Development to the west, further from the town centre would have extended a linear form of development, encouraging further out commuting.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Jo Gurteen					<p>To the west of Haverhill we have the routes to Cambridge, London, the Midlands etc. There is no need to build on the east as peoples need is to go west. There are also no large roads or bypasses going to the east, no need for them, impossible to make them now anyway.</p> <p>3. The is no direct access to present or planned bypasses to the north south or east, therefore it is not a workable solution.</p> <p>4. The present minor roads are small and make up the character of the surrounding villages and hamlets. Kedington Road and Calford Green cannot be enlarged as there are houses either side of the road. These roads cannot sustain the increase of traffic the development would bring. Also changes to these roads would adversely change the character of the Calford Green(Suffolk) and Kedington End(Essex), the vision wishes to retain character.</p> <p>5. Bringing lorries and working vehicle onto site would create problems on the south,east and north roads as there is not enough width to allow 2 lorries side by side in several places.</p>	<p>With access to the development area being predominantly from the north-west and west, there should be little impact upon the roads of the surrounding villages. Access to the south has the potential to impact on the area to the east and this is acknowledged. Accordingly, changes are proposed as detailed in Chapter 16.</p>	<p>No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.</p>

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Jo Gurteen					<p>6. I dispute point 5.13, that the proposed development land on the south east integrates with the existing town, it is too far to walk into town (I know, I have tried to and am a fit 40 something, it takes almost one hour!)</p> <p>Also, there is a clear split from the 'Woodlands Hotel' to the east that shows this part of the development does not integrate with the present houses.</p> <p>7. The proposed map outline disagrees with the Core Strategy of not merging with nearby settlements. I agree it is far away enough from Kedington centre but merges too closely with Calford Green. I disagree even if this most westerly land is used as 'amenity', as this is forcing people to come further east for recreation when the plan is to keep the community together and use the town centre more.</p> <p>8. Concern points to the land by Calford Green being for social activity. This could mean anything, especially as the development point to being 'lively' (5.15).</p>	<p>The area to the south east has been the subject of changes as detailed in Chapter 16. It is not unusual for towns to have parks and large areas of informal open space on their periphery as these cannot be created in town centres. The alternative of no open space is not an option.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Jo Gurteen					<p>9. I disagree the boundaries will be 'safe' due to; Most of Coupals Road and the whole of the road from Kedington to Sturmer cannot be walked cycled on safely due to narrowness, blind bends, present traffic.</p> <p>I disagree the south east portion of the development will be safe due to;</p> <p>Flooding of the lat 2 fields to the left within the boundary, water gushes down this hill. The stream and brooks at the bottom is a danger.</p> <p>The proximity of the golf club means danger of stray balls (my friend was hit will one outside the confines of the green). Please note, the golfing greens are not hatched on the map correctly, as they go on another field to the left of the hatch and finish at Calford Green's southerly point.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that much of Coupals Road in currently unsuited to pedestrians and cyclists. However, the changes proposed at Chapter 16 should address this issue.</p> <p>Flooding will need to be addressed and attenuated. The golfing greens are not identified on the concept plan. The only hatching relates to those areas which are located within Essex.</p>	<p>No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.</p>
	Mrs Jo Gurteen					<p>Changes and Suggestions;</p> <p>Development of the west, south west and north west of Haverhill should be preferred due to the above points. Even estate agents note when selling housing 'on the preferred Cambridge side of town'. This will ensure more people live within Haverhill as it ticks more boxes for them.</p> <p>Why do we wish to have development not close to a bypass? Surely it is a cheaper, more sustainable and ecological option to be on green land to the south and west and east of the present bypass? This land currently looks underutilised.</p> <p>Railway system.</p> <p>Re-opening the rail link or having another source of travel would put Haverhill on the map and ensure a larger future.</p> <p>Can we not use the 'Project office' site for housing, or the pitches next to the current bypass?</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Yet again another huge greenfield site. I would like to see much smaller pockets of development rather than these huge estates. Please retain all woodland and hedgerows.	Although a large area in total, it will not all be developed at once. The masterplan approach should identify smaller neighbourhoods, each with its own identity. The concept plan in Chapter 16 does identify retention of hedgerows and woodlands.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	yes	<p>In drawing up the proposed boundaries for the new neighbourhood at north-east Haverhill careful consideration has been given to a number of aspects including planning policies in the adopted Core Strategy, background technical work such as topography, landscape and highways, and comments made during the Issues and Options consultation on the draft Haverhill Vision 2031 in March 2011.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the need to maintain the identity and segregation of Kedington and Little Wrating, which is set out as a policy requirement in CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy. In addition, consideration has been given to the relationship between Calford Green and the new neighbourhood which, while not a policy requirement of Policy CS12, is another factor in the emerging design and layout of the proposed development. As such, the preferred option concept plan provides a significant area of strategic amenity space as a buffer between Calford Green and the new neighbourhood.</p>	This support is welcomed. Changes are proposed to the concept plan which should address any discrepancies.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a		<p>When a comparison is made between the land shown as the north-east Haverhill allocation on the Proposals Map (red on Inset 3) and the red boundary plan for the new neighbourhood shown in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document (page 26) there are several discrepancies;</p> <p>(1) The strategic greenfield allocation shown on the Proposals Map should extend further north-east along Wratting Road/Haverhill Road, as shown on the red boundary plan in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document.</p> <p>(2) The strategic greenfield allocation shown on the Proposals Map should extend further westwards along Chalkstone Way, as shown on the boundary plan in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document. As currently drawn, the Proposals Map inaccurately shows the 'recreational open space' allocation (yellow) extending too far eastwards along Chalkstone Way.</p>		
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				no	I believe it expands too far to the east and shouldn't include Calford and Woodland Green within the proposed area.	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed are contained in the Concept Statement.	No changes required to boundary although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development. See separate changes to Concept Staement.
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	No opinion - Coupals Road would have to be widened and straightened to accommodate substantial increase in traffic.	Thank you for responding. Amendments to the concept plan address the issue identified in respect of Coupals Road.	No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15891	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	no	In respect of the land at Woodlands Motel, Coupals Road, Haverhill (which lies within Braintree District - see attached map), we believe that the Council should discuss with the adjoining planning authority the possibility of including the land north of Coupals Road that lies within the Braintree DC area, within the boundary for the North-East Haverhill allocation. Paragraph 181 of the NPPF requires LPA's to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their local plans are submitted for examination. We believe that the exclusion of this area from NE Haverhill has only been made because the land is within an adjoining planning authority (and County), however, looking at both physical and natural boundaries to the southern edge of the allocation, which closely follows Coupals Road to the east, it clearly makes no sense to exclude the land north of Coupals Road from the allocation. There is a golf course to the south of Coupals Road, which makes a clear and logical boundary to the NE Haverhill allocation.	Although the NPPF includes a duty to cooperate between authorities, it is for Braintree District to decide whether it wishes bring forward its own Area Action Plan for the land at Sturmer. See comment below.	No changes required
	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	Paul Sutton	Cheffins		Despite the land falling within Braintree DC area, we believe that, in the light of the NPPF, the Council need to demonstrate that they have considered the possible inclusion of this land within the NE Haverhill allocation as it makes sound planning sense and would provide a more logical southern boundary to the allocation.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15896	Emma Goodings	Braintree District Council			no	Braintree District Council are concerned about far southeast the boundaries of the north east growth location are as they effectively wrap around an area of the District which would be surrounded by urban Haverhill on two sides. It would seem more sensible for the edge of the growth location to be in line with the edge of current built development in Haverhill at Roman Way/Marcus Close. This boundary also brings the site in close proximity to the village of Sturmer, who wish to maintain their identity and village character and not be seen as part of urban Haverhill.	These concerns have been addressed in the revisions to the draft concept plan in Chapter 16.	No changes required to boundary although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development. See separate changes to Concept Plan.
HVR15897	Peter Donoghue				no	I disagree with the boundaries shown for the following reasons: 1 There needs to be a clear and natural distinction between any extension of Haverhill and the hamlet of Calford Green. The boundary shown goes right up to the backs of the Calford Green houses. 2 The nearest natural boundary to Calford Green is the line of trees and wooded area along the SE edge of your red-lined area, which is also a ridge. Land east of this drops away to a stream and then up again to the hamlet, so any development in this area will have clear inter-visibility with the houses of Calford Green, thus blurring the distinction between town and country.	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed are contained in the Concept Plan in Chapter 16	No changes required although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Donoghue					<p>3 The existing roads on the Haverhill side of this eastern part of the site, ie Shetland Road and Roman Way, have not been laid out with a view to being extended to serve the site; indeed it is difficult to see where this part of the site can be served from. The Concept Plan shows road connections to the west, leaving the whole of the eastern half of the site as a cul-de-sac (apart from the "country lane" shown connecting to Coupals Road).</p> <p>4 It seems very likely that drivers looking for a route eastwards, and wishing to avoid a long diversion through the centre of Haverhill, will find a way onto the narrow Coupals Road, and from there onto the equally narrow and winding B1061/Water Lane at Sturmer. These are small country roads already subject to an unsuitable volume, size and speed of traffic, especially at rush hour. They are incapable of safely taking any more.</p>	There is no intention to connect roads to Shetland Road and Roman Way. Changes identified in the concept plan in Chapter 16 should address some of the concerns with Coupals Road. Should anyone wish to travel in a south easterly direction, this route already exists. Anyone wishing to travel in a north easterly direction will have direct access to the A134.	No changes required
	Peter Donoghue					<p>5 I understand that earlier proposals for a North-East Haverhill relief road have now been abandoned, due to the impossibility of acquiring the land necessary. This factor alone should rule out development on the eastern part of the site.</p> <p>6 I suggest that, in circulation terms, only the western half of the site is suitable for development, since it has connections to both Chalkstone Way and Wratting Road, which would help to integrate it into the town's existing street pattern. The eastern half is simply a very large cul-de-sac, remote from the town's facilities.</p>	<p>The north-east relief road option was removed because there was no evidence that it was required.</p> <p>The purpose of the community hub is to provide facilities within a walkable neighbourhood. Therefore, the close proximity to Shetland Road as the crow flies is relevant as footpath links can be made, without the need to resort to the car.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Donoghue					<p>7 The proposed community hub seems mis-conceived, the result of wishful thinking. Because of the site's poor connectivity, the hub with its community centre and local shops is unlikely to generate sufficient custom or interest to succeed. The residents of Shetlands Road, for instance, although close as the crow flies, would be unable to reach it by car without a long diversion. It is also not en route to anywhere else, so there would be no passing traffic. A better location would be on Chalkstone Way at the junction of the new access road, where it is likely to draw custom from existing areas.</p> <p>8 This last point shows up the weakness of the whole concept: the development of this site has been viewed in isolation from its surroundings, rather than seen primarily as an opportunity to enhance the whole area. A cloak of "sustainability" has been wrapped around a plan designed to fit a pre-determined number of homes onto a pre-determined site.</p>	Quite the contrary. The whole concept has been based upon integrating any development into the town and its surrounding area. Although the general area has been pre-determined (adopted Core Strategy), the site has not.	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no	This is too large an area and too close to Calford Green	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed and amendments to the area close to Calford green are contained in the Concept Plan in Chapter 16.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			no	The Parish Council would like to see the redrawing of the boundary of the north east strategic site to include, at least, a 200m to 300m buffer or green belt which protects the integrity of the hamlets of Calford Green and Woodland Green as well as Sturmer Common and Sturmer Village.	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed and amendments to the area close to Calford green are contained in the Concept Plan in Chapter 16. The changes suggested would be best addressed through the concept plan, not by adjusting the strategic boundaries.	No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no	Further discussed in answer 35		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the general expansion of the Borough and its promotion as a growth area. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings across the Borough as a whole, to more moderate levels. The Core Strategy should be revisited and the expansion plans to the Borough changed to accord with residents' views. There is no legal obligation to continue with the housing targets imposed by the East of England Regional Authority. Any development of this site should meet the approval of the local residents, including the final number of dwellings to be built.	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.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council does not object to the boundaries of this allocation, but we would object to development that detrimentally affects the setting of the Scheduled Monument at Great Wilsey Farm (DSF 33287) 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 matters will need to be taken into account in the preparation of the masterplan. Further discussions will be required. Any development in the vicinity of Great Wilsey Farm will have to take account of the setting of the Scheduled monument.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no	Should include land to join the Haverhill by-pass at Sturmer.	The north-east relief road option was removed because there was no evidence that it was required.	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	The boundary to the north should be a road that starts at the North West and ends to the North East at the Sturmer roundabout. No roads leading into Chalkstone Way and Coupals Road because of using the roads as rat runs to the industrial estates.	The north-east relief road option was removed because there was no evidence that it was required.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no	open areas should be kept and not merged	The boundaries identified by Policy HV6 define the extent of the strategic growth area including open space and strategic landscaping, not the extent of built development. Details of how the site might be developed are contained in the Concept Plan in Chapter 16.	No changes required although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development.
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	No further house building on green or healthy agricultural land just to satisfy the whim of a wealthy landowner who wants to retire.	Growth is required to meet the needs of a growing community. There are insufficient brownfield sites in Haverhill to meet these needs.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	Greenfield sites i.e. farmland, woodland and any existing countryside should NEVER be built on. Therefore there should be no further expansion of Haverhill, whether it be residential, commercial or industrial, on any site other than existing brownfield sites!	Growth is required to meet the needs of a growing community. There are insufficient brownfield sites in Haverhill to meet these needs.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Couples road is not suitable for access because it is almost a single lane in some parts. My father-in-law's car was forced off the road along this road leading to him hitting a post. Following the building on the Chalkstone playing fields there is more traffic by Mott's field now that the football pitches there are used more often. When the local dump is busy at the weekend the bottom part of Chalkstone way often becomes blocked. It will be even worse if the Snooker club is developed into houses as proposed. This road is currently causing problems even before more cars are sent along it. Please can you look into the trouble caused by parked cars along Motts field.	The problems associated with Coupals Road are acknowledged and the concept plan at Chapter 16 has been amended in response to these. Any localised problems associated with car parking can be investigated.	No changes required to boundary. See separate changes to Concept Plan.
	Jason					The new Westfield school is now open and the new development has not included a pathway across the top of the underpass bridge. I would guess that about 70% of Samuel Ward students walk along the road over this section each day and now some primary kids will be doing the same but in the other direction. Is it wise to send even more traffic along this road? Surely commonsense should have been used and a path crated between the New Croft path and the Westfield school path.	Any changes to the highway layout will need to take full account of these issues.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 6: North-east Haverhill (HV3)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the boundaries for the north-east Haverhill site identified on the Proposals Map (Poicy HV3)?	Quesiton 6b - If not, please explain why and what changes you would like to be made?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no	Because this contravenes statement of 5.13 re careful planning being required to ensure that merging with the nearby settlements of Little Wratting and Kedington (including Calford Green) does not occur.	The area to the south east has been the subject of changes as detailed in Chapter 16 to address this issue.	No changes required to boundary although a distinction between the proposed housing settlement boundary and allocation boundary would help clarify the extent of development. See separate changes to Concept Plan.
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Housing planned for Haverhill should be within the boundary of Haverhill. Haverhill already has a clearly defined green boundary buffer which should not be built beyond.	The principle of developing this area of land was established by the adoption of the Core Strategy on 2010, There is insufficient land available within the existing built up area of Haverhill to meet the identified needs.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15705	Mr & Mrs M Roake				no	<p>The plans to develop this site are not yet designed to fulfil a genuine local and economic need.</p> <p>The concerns of our community below are more for the health and well-being of future generations. The majority of these involved have lived in the immediate area for an average of twenty five years.</p> <p>This very small piece of land is all we have left from the last forty years. It is all we have in the way of safe outside space for our children and grandchildren to play safely.</p> <p>All the other local green areas we had have been built on. We do not think it is much to ask for this little green space for those of us who not only brought OUR children up on this little piece of green but still use it for our grandchildren. Many residents have held street parties for the silver jubilee and other special occasions.</p>	<p>This parcel of land has been allocated for development for many years, albeit for a local centre. This allocation changes the nature of that development. However, an open area including a play area has been maintained adjacent to this area to the rear of houses fronting Rosefinch Close and it would be appropriate to continue this along the north western part of the site. A similar open space exists to the east at Osprey Road and a large area to the south of Millfields Way opposite the site has been kept free from development and now forms a County Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The draft concept statement referred to in the document as being in Appendix 3 relates to the Strategic allocation for North East Haverhill and relates to Question 6.</p>	Move the reference to the draft concept statement to the preceeding section.
HVR15705	Mr & Mrs M Roake				no	<p>We have lost all of our immediate play areas for our children. Over the last forty years any space given to our children or play space has been built on or taken away; there is no provision for our children. And our children are Haverhill's future.</p> <p>Other worries are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of privacy 2. Overdevelopment 3. Anglian Water has also objected 		
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The design briefs should include appropriate recreational areas for children in the immediate vicinity. The site at Millfields Way/Kestrel Road is already the subject of a planning application and likely to proceed before this Vision is adopted. Should it be removed from the Vision ?	Should work commence to develop this site it would be appropriate to delete the allocation.	Provide clarification of the base date for the inclusion of sites, allowing for any subsequent planning permissions.
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no	Being a Suffolk man I prefer to see green areas remain that way.	These are both sites which have previously been identified for development. These proposed allocations introduce an alternative form of development.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15777	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology			no	This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This information is gratefully received and will require further action at Development Brief or planning application stage.	
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15867	Mr K Fowler				no	83 dwellings too many for site.	The exact number of dwellings will be determined following a more detailed assessment of the site and the nature and character of the development proposed. The figure of 83 is a very crude assessment based solely upon the site area.	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Yes this sort of integrated smaller development is much better.	Thank you for your observations	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				no and yes	no and yes - Additional traffic for Chapelwent Road will cause problems at traffic lights. Millfields / Kestral Road ok.	The impact of additional traffic will have to be assessed prior to the determination of any planning application.	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	It is far more sensible to make use of sites which are closer to the town's facilities for housing. Such small scale developments across the town and within its' existing conurbation help to promote communal cohesion and social integration.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	<p>We object to the general expansion of the Borough and its promotion as a growth area. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings across the Borough as a whole, to more moderate levels.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should be revisited and the expansion plans to the Borough changed to accord with residents' views.</p> <p>There is no legal obligation to continue with the housing targets imposed by the East of England Regional Authority.</p> <p>Any development of this site should meet the approval of the local residents, including the final number of dwellings to be built.</p> <p>Development of Brownfield sites must first be exhausted before any Greenfield sites are considered for development.</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.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16013	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) This site is adjacent to Haverhill Disused railway Line CWS. This site should be subject to a reptile survey prior to any development being considered. The combination of rough grassland and hedgerows also make this site suitable for nesting and foraging birds.	This information is gratefully received and will require further action.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council would like to remind St Edmundsbury that the county council's option to build a school on HV4a) does not expire until 2017. Paragraph 5.16 should be rewritten to reflect this and the fact that the option was for a school, and not a middle school specifically. The county council does not object to the use of this site for housing if it is subsequently found not to be required for school provision. Regarding Site HV4a), this option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). The transport impact of site HV4a needs to be considered in combination with that of the NW development. We have no objection in principle to site HV4b), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	The inclusion of the site for housing does not preclude the site from being brought forward for a school.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no	Should have a lake.	Any development of either site will require sustainable drainage. Whether this will require a lake is unknown at this stage.	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	No further house building on green or agricultural land. The land off Kestrel Road is the remnant of what was a very useful area for ball games and the like. The previous heavily used swing park was demolished with a promise to replace elsewhere in the local area. That never happened. So this land, which is on a slop and no good for elderly residents, should remain as is.	This parcel of land has always been allocated for development, albeit for a local centre. This allocation changes the nature of that development. However, an open area including a play area has been maintained adjacent to this area to the rear of houses fronting Rosefinch Close and it would be appropriate to continue this along the north western part of the site. A similar open space exists to the east at Osprey Road and a large area to the south of Millfields Way opposite the site has been kept free from development and now forms a County Wildlife Site. The draft concept statement referred to in the document as being in Appendix 3 is missing relates to the strategic development at North East Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	See question 6	Growth is required to meet the needs of a growing community. There are insufficient brownfield sites in Haverhill to meet these needs.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson							
HVR21676E	Jason				no	There are already plans for Boyton Hall, Hamlet Croft and I guess that you will look to build on the brown field sites of the closed middle schools that are lying vandalised. Services and facilities are not improved in proportion to the population increase. There are drainage problems currently all over town and not enough park land.	Both sites have previously been identified for development, albeit in a different form from that now proposed. There is a need for services and facilities to be improved to cater for such growth. It is likely that the site at Chapelwent Road is of such a size that significant contributions will be required to meet the demands placed upon services arising from its development. Drainage issues are known and all development will have to incorporate sustainable urban drainage principles.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21740E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 7: Greenfield sites (HV4)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with Policy HV4?	Question 7b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15687	Gordon Mussett	Hartseats Limited			no	<p>Haverhill Vision 2031 - Site Reference HV6d - Cleales/Town Hall Car Park</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation. The standard consultation form does not meet our requirements, so I am writing to express our concerns at aspects of the scheme.</p> <p>We are a commercial company operating within a major public visitor attraction (40,000+ visits per annum), located in Haverhill High Street. We operate seven days per week, between 8.30 a.m. and 2.00 a.m. the following morning. The majority of our customers use the public car parks, particularly the Cleales/Town Hall Car Park, and we would OBJECT strongly to any proposals that may reduce the number of car parking spaces available within 100 metres of our address.</p> <p>In addition, the provision of residential dwellings on the north (High Street) side of the Cleales/Town Hall Car Park will have an impact on the ability of existing business premises to trade without an increase in complaints regarding noise, particularly late evening noise, and we would thus OBJECT to that element of any detailed future design.</p>	These concerns are acknowledged and can be applied to most, if not all of the identified sites within the town centre. The nature of the area and the complexity of issues within and surrounding the town centre are such that they cannot be adequately considered in this document, which is why it is proposed that a town centre masterplan will be prepared to consider these matters in detail.	No changes required
	Gordon Mussett	Hartseats Limited				<p>However, should the Council be minded to approve this site allocation, we would ask that it does so in the understanding that a significant sum should be conveyed from the developer by way of Section 106, or Community Infrastructure Levy monies to contribute to enhancing the rear street scene of those High Street properties backing onto the site, including opening up rear access/servicing where this does not currently exist at present.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15706	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council	no	<p>The AXA car park is invariably fully used on weekdays. Displaced cars from there will exacerbate the problems in Hamlet Road and overrun the shoppers car park.</p> <p>At evenings and weekends the Town Hall car park is well used. Similar displacement problems will occur.</p> <p>Access for delivery vehicles to the High Street shops must be preserved, not least because this will impact on possible pedestrianisation.</p> <p>Proposals to create a traffic route to avoid the high Street will be prejudiced by any development on this area.</p>	These concerns are acknowledged and can be applied to most, if not all of the identified sites within the town centre. The nature of the area and the complexity of issues within and surrounding the town centre are such that they cannot be adequately considered in this document, which is why it is proposed that a town centre masterplan will be prepared to consider these matters in detail.	No changes required
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council		<p>When the Alr Ambulance was required recently the car park was the only feasible landing point, the nearest alternative was the recreation ground in Camps Road. Pedestrian access between this site and the town centre is very poor.</p> <p>In addition, the provision of residential dwellings on the north (High Street) side of the Cleales/Town Hall Car Park will have an impact on the ability of existing business premises to trade without an increase in complaints regarding noise, particularly late evening noise, and we would thus OBJECT to that element of any detailed future design.</p> <p>However, should the Council be minded to approve this site allocation, we would ask that it does so in the understanding that a significant sum should be conveyed from the developer by way of Section 106, or Community Infrastructure Levy monies to contribute to enhancing the rear street scene of those High Street properties backing onto the site, including opening up rear access/servicing where this does not currently exist at present.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	In HV5 the site of the former Castle Hill Middle School is inappropriate for housing development, being otherwise isolated and separated from existing residential development by areas of public open space. Given its location the site may be better reserved for some form of community use, either in association with, or independent of, the surrounding public open spaces. Neither Hamlet Croft nor the Atterton and Ellis sites have adequate road capacity for the levels of development proposed. Both sites have restricted access for traffic and the cumulative impact on the Hamlet Road heritage locations would be disastrous. The Chantry Mill site has substantial heritage artefacts and structures which should be protected in any development. Given that the Vision identifies the retail area of the town as very limited. Previously some of the sites identified in Policy HV6 have been identified for future retail/office development, as well as car parking.	It is accepted that the site of the Castle Hill school buildings is isolated and unrelated to existing residential development. There is no evidence to suggest that there is inadequate road capacity for the development at Hamlet Croft and the development at Atterton and Ellis already benefits from planning permission. Chantry Mill is a listed building and requires careful consideration. Policy HV6 does recognise that the site is suitable for mixed development which may include residential. There is no evidence that the introduction of a residential element within a town centre will weaken retail opportunities. Those town centres which perform well contain a mix of uses including residential elements.	Amend the Castle Hill allocation to include an area equivalent to the built-up area of the school on the Chivers Road frontage, south of Lavender Walk, with the area of existing (former) school buildings being made available as recreational open space and allotments to compensate for the loss of open space fronting Chivers Road. Delete the Atterton and Ellis allocation.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				There has to be concern that the addition of residential development in these proposals may lead to both a weakening of future retail development opportunities, and affect existing town centre businesses by way of imposing restrictions on existing late evening operations. There is no evidence presented to reflect the need for town centre residential development other than (potentially, but not in practice) the opportunity for more sustainable development by reducing car use. Chantry Mill and Cleales/Town Hall Car Park provide a unique opportunity to address the diversion of traffic from the shopping centre. That opportunity should be protected in the Vision. Additionally the opportunity to improve the High Street relies on preserving delivery access to the retail outlets. Neither of these important sites should be compromised by residential development. The Wisdom site is entirely suitable for residential development. Proposals should seek to retain the 'green' corridor separating the site from the Industrial Estates in Hollands Road.		
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				The car park areas between the High Street and Ehringhausens Way incorporate an important transport hub and should be preserved. Any proposals to limit street parking on the High Street will be compromised by the loss of any parking capacity. Any developments in this area should seek to connect the High Street to the Leisure hub. Additional brownfield site : The existing bus depot on Duddery Hill has become enclosed by residential development and is no longer an appropriate site for this activity. If the facilities could be moved to an area of industrial estate this would free up the land for residential development and benefit the service operators through greater scope for industrial processes and better access to the road network.	The issues relating to the area around the Brook road car park and bus station are important matters which need to be addressed fully in the town vcentre masterplan proposed at Policy HV19. The bus depot at Duddery Hill is already included within the Housing Settlement Boundary and could be considered for residential development, should a proposal be submitted.	
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15725	John Benton				no	The old gas works site is much larger for development than you show on your map?	Much of the old gasworks site has high wildlife value and there are access limitations onto Withersfield road.	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15730	Helen Bates	Roman Catholic Diocese of East Anglia			no	<p>1. There would be concern if new housing is situated within the boundary of the site as identified in the accompanying Ordnance Survey illustration. Whilst housing fronting Chilvers Road to the west of the Castle Hill site would be preferable, if the housing fronts School Lane this will increase congestion on School Lane and it is likely that parents from the two schools on this road would end up parking around the new housing.</p> <p>2. The Haverhill Vision 2031 para 5.37(i) refers to the provision of a footpath/cycleway between Chilvers Road and School Lane. Whilst St Felix School's playing field is in the ownership of Suffolk County Council, we would request that the Diocese of East Anglia is consulted at the appropriate time regarding the precise location of the footpath/cycleway as this could have significant implication for the safety of children at the school if it crosses the school site.</p>	It is accepted that the site of the Castle Hill school buildings is isolated and unrelated to existing residential development. The opportunity also exists to provide a footpath and cycle link from Chivers Road to the two remaining schools, to reduce reliance on cars.	Amend the Castle Hill allocation to include an area equivalent to the built-up area of the school on the Chivers Road frontage, south of Lavender Walk, with the area of existing (former) school buildings being made available as recreational open space and allotments to compensate for the loss of open space fronting Chivers Road and make provision for a footpath/cycle link from Chivers Road to the remaining schools.
HVR15777	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.	This information is gratefully received and will require further action at planning application stage.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no	No sooner than the leaflet is published indicating Landscape areas in Castle Reach/Castle playing fields then notices of plans to build on one of the fields appear building 100 houses. That particular land does have orchids on it a fact know to the Parks department when they leave from mowing in late Spring the area laterally the full width by 20 yards from the roundabout to Chimswell Wood.	All of the sites proposed for development are already developed in one form or another. However, the proposed changes outlined above would involve the development of an open space and the creation of a new area of open space to compensate. It is suspected that this comment relates to an area of land identified in Policy HV6 addressed in Question 9.	See proposed amendments to Policy HV7
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	HV5 yes but HV6 - how can you plan to redevelop ALL the car parking sites in the town when you havent even been able to get the High Street pedestrianised yet? NOT the Arts Centre and Cleales car parks there has to be some car parking provision. This is not the ideal world of the future where we all walk everywhere with a smile on our face. Suitable for housing development - What about the BT telephone exchange site in Chantry Road - it generates a great deal of traffic of large sided vans in a narrow and beautiful residential street.	Redevelopment of a car park does not necessarily mean the loss of all of the parking. Open surface parking consumes large areas. The nature of the area and the complexity of issues within and surrounding the town centre are such that they cannot be adequately considered in this document, which is why it is proposed that a town centre masterplan will be prepared to consider these matters in detail.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15869	Peter Freestone				yes	Dear Sir, Madam, or whoever it may concern, with reference to Castle Hill Middle School, off School Lane proposed development site. I have lived in 6 Knights Court for 50 years, my lounge window overlooks School Lane and the proposed site. I have no objection to dwellings being built there as long as they are of a moderate design and built for occupants having consideration for others. What I would not want to see is blocks of flats with ugly roof design similar to that displayed in certain parts of Haverhill. It is rumoured that areas of Haverhill are allocated to single mums and the inevitable visits of virile young men. This would be detrimental to this area. Quality houses would not sell easily on this site being so close to a school, although I have never experienced any problems, it would be too quiet without them,	It is accepted that the site of the Castle Hill school buildings is isolated and unrelated to existing residential development. The opportunity also exists to provide a footpath and cycle link from Chivers Road to the two remaining schools, to reduce reliance on cars.	Amend the Castle Hill allocation to include an area equivalent to the built-up area of the school on the Chivers Road frontage, south of Lavender Walk, with the area of existing (former) school buildings being made available as recreational open space and allotments to compensate for the loss of open space fronting Chivers Road and make provision for a footpath/cycle link from Chivers Road to the remaining schools.
	Peter Freestone					One other concern of mine is the traffic problem, it is chaos in School Lane when parents bring and collect their children, this is not made easier through the lack of double yellow lines at the bottom of the road and adjacent to the crossing and the stupidity of two traffic calming methods in what we locals call Waterworks Hill. Surely the proposed development won't go ahead unless one-way traffic is enforced with an outlet in Strawberry Field estate.		
HVR15871	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	HV5 - Yes HV6 - No These are much better proposals - smaller and easy to integrate. I do not think that there should be access to Castle Hill site across the playingfield. These should have been separate questions. What about the empty site on Hamlet Green - former project site. HV6 - Cleales site should become a park. HV6 - I think that the Chantry Mill and Wisdom Factory should be retained and converted not destroyed.	These concerns are acknowledged. The nature of the area and the complexity of issues within and surrounding the town centre are such that they cannot be adequately considered in this document, which is why it is proposed that a town centre masterplan will be prepared to consider these matters in detail.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				no	Generally believe in suggestions with the exception of Atterton and Ellis and Chantry Mill. Think the buildings should be restored - used as small business centre / special shops /exhibitions.	Noted. The Atterton and Ellis site already has planning permission for sympathetic redevelopment, retaining the most historic buildings and reproducing the form of the remainder. Chantry Mill is Listed Building (Grade 2) and will require careful consideration which is beyond the scope of this document.	Delete the Atterton and Ellis allocation.
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	1. Development at former Castle Hill Middle site would only be possible if there is additiohnal access; School Lane cannot accommodate more traffic. 2. Historic silk factory (Wisdom Factory) should be preserved in redevelopment.	The access issue at Castle Hill is acknowledged and changes are proposed. It is assumed that the preservation of of the Historic silk factory relates to the red brick Victorian building in Colne Valley road and not the later concrete and brick factory buildings.	See amendments above relating to castle Hill Middle school
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes	Box ticked yes subject to comments below. The Corporate Property Division of Suffolk County Council supports the identification of the former Westfield and Castle Hill School sites, which are now surplus to requirements following the recent implementation of the Schools Organisation Review in Haverhill. Westfield School The Corporate Property Division of the County Council supports the wording (para 5.21) and the identification of the potential developable area, as set out in the Vision Statement. Castle Hill Middle School The Corporate Property Division of the County Council considers that the indicative developable area, together with the wording at paragraph 5.22, relating to the Castle Hill site should be amended to identify all of the existing school buildings and hard surfaced play areas, as they front School Lane, together with the adjacent Council Maintenance Depot (which is also surplus to requirements and shortly to be closed and relocated) for potential development.	The Castle Manor Middle school site has been the subject of concern relating to its relationship with the surrounding area and access. Significant changes are proposed to the policy to relocate the allocation away from the school buildings and to extend the open space to include the existing site of the former school buildings.	No changes required
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		Included, as part of these representations, is a plan showing the area which Corporate Property considers should be identified for potential development. Corporate Property also requests that paragraph 5.22 be re-worded as: 'This is another school site which has become vacant following reorganisation of the education system. The existing playing fields form part of a wider important area of open space and should be retained as open space, but the built up area of the school, together with the formal playground areas and the adjacent County Council Maintenance Depot, are available for development. No development shall take place until a development brief has been approved for the site'		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15903	Mrs P Henderson Gray	St. Felix RC Primary			no	Our main concern is the already hazardous conditions at the start and end of each school day on School Lane. We have tried numerous methods to control some of the traffic problems and even the local beat officer, PC Wright, is aware & has made many visits about the situation. Extra housing can only exacerbate the situation. Paragraph 5.35, would therefore be preferable .	The access concerns raised are acknowledged.	Amend the Castle Hill allocation to include an area equivalent to the built-up area of the school on the Chivers Road frontage, south of Lavender Walk, with the area of existing (former) school buildings being made available as recreational open space and allotments to compensate for the loss of open space fronting Chivers Road and make provision for a footpath/cycle link from Chivers Road to the remaining schools.
HVR15932	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				5.19 Former Gas Works, Withersfield Road As discussed within section 5.19, the site has been cleared, however contamination may still be present. The land should be investigated appropriately with suitable remediation measures undertaken if contaminated is identified.	Thank you for this information.	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15971	Ms M F Henderson					<p>I am concerned about the future development of HV6b (Chantry Mill Site) and cannot stress enough that the removal of asbestos there needs to be given very serious consideration.</p> <p>I assume you are retaining the Listed Building. The most important point concerns the removal of the ancillary buildings, which have asbestos roofs, downpipes and gutters.</p> <p>This will be an expensive undertaking, which needs to be approached meticulously. Great care will have to be taken to ensure that asbestos dust does not spread over the adjoining areas, where many young families live. No short cuts should be taken by the firm engaged to carry out the work and the highest standards should be the prior consideration, not cost. Presumably the land will have to remain fallow for a time, as is the case with former filling stations/garages.</p> <p>Development of the site for car parking or even business premises or retail use could be entertained.</p>	Noted. Chantry Mill is Listed Building (Grade 2) and will require careful consideration which is beyond the scope of this document.	No changes required
	Ms M F Henderson					<p>I believe housing to be an unsuitable use for the site, as the entire infrastructure would have to be reconstructed, namely sewage, water supply, electricity supply, gas connections, notwithstanding probable alteration to the unadopted road or bridleway containing Maypole Terrace. Please try to retain existing trees and some grassed areas of the Chantry Mills site.</p> <p>It is almost impossible to predict trends in the next 20 years. There may well be migration from the South East of England, with less inward immigration from other parts of Britain and Europe.</p>		
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	Additionally, housing development should be permitted on allocated but unused commercial and industrial sites across the town.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			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 approval of local residents. 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. 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.	The need for growth in Haverhill 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. The document seeks to address the issue of unacceptable 'garden grabbing', and the criteria for the consideration of such applications is incorporated into the Draft Development Management Document.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				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 polices 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. 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.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council does not object to these sites being allocated for development, provided that transport impacts are sufficiently mitigated and all infrastructure needs are met. Regarding the historic environment, we have no objection in principle to development at any of these sites, but they will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	This information is gratefully received and will require further action at planning application stage.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no	A) Former Gasworks Withersfield road and D) Former Castle Hill Middle School site. Should be used to create a 2nd cemetery for the town with access on Chivers Road	The suitability and availability of these sites for such a specific use has not been assessed. The Gasworks site is located in close proximity to the Stour Brook and may prove unsuitable. All suitable options should remain open.	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Enhance rear access from High Street shops and Chantry Mill for Cleales/Town Hall Car Park. Additional brownfield site: existing bus depot should be moved and becomes a residential site.	Noted. The document cannot require an existing lawful use to be relocated, but it would already support redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	Castle Hill school development needs proper consultation with the adjoining 2 schools and local residents. Argos parking should be kept for disabled and short stop access to the town shops.	Adjoining schools and residents have been consulted in respect of the castle Hill site. The Argos parking is in private ownership and the option of who should be able to park there is a matter for the owners. The document identifies the opportunity for this area to be brought forward to provide more opportunities to improve facilities in the town centre.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	<p>I have no problem with the old gas works nor particularly with Hamlet Croft. However I never agreed with removing middle school education due to the excessive cost (which has now been proven). Westfield School should become some sort of education establishment perhaps as a higher education offshoot for adult education. Castle Hill should be demolished and made into an extension of the existing playing fields or handed over to allotments.</p> <p>As for Gurteens, Havebury Housing Partnership have had a long term plan to convert the main building into 110 self-contained apartments which is noticeably absent from this Vision Statement.</p> <p>The existing car parks should be retained if ever pedestrianisation is ever to occur as they are a good outside edge facility.</p> <p>The Wisdom factory is a prime candidate for brownfield housing redevelopment.</p>	The change in the education system is a matter of fact which needs to be recognised by this document. The future of the former Westfield School has been the subject of a separate design brief for residential development, which was subject to prior extensive public consultation. See comments above in respect of the Castle Hill site. The future of the Chantry Mill requires very careful consideration. There is no known plan for Havebury to convert the building into apartments. An appropriate provision of car parking will need to be made to meet current and future needs for the town centre. However, open surface car parking consumes large areas. Brownfield housing is one possible option for the Wisdom factory site.	Amend the Castle Hill allocation to include an area equivalent to the built-up area of the school on the Chivers Road frontage, south of Lavender Walk, with the area of existing (former) school buildings being made available as recreational open space and allotments to compensate for the loss of open space fronting Chivers Road and make provision for a footpath/cycle link from Chivers Road to the remaining schools.
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes	...and only development on brownfield sites	The opportunities for brownfield development are very limited and cannot meet the future needs for growth in Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Are they being sold to the highest bidder? The closed middle schools that are lying vandalised.	This is private matter for the landowners and is beyond the scope of this document.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 8: Brownfield sites (HV5 HV6)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with allocating these brownfield sites in Policies HV5 and HV6 for development?	Question 8b - If not, what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion	Recommendation that a health impact assessment for developments in brownfields sites so that the impact on human health is explicitly considered.	An assessment for contamination will need to be made for each site prior to redevelopment and remediation measures taken where necessary.	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no	The area that you are proposing to build HV7b on is an green open space. When we purchased this house in 1999 we were assured that this area would never be built on. Had we been aware that it would be we would not have purchased our home. Our children frequently play on this open space and it is a space that we can see from our home. Any further away and our children will be unable to play out. There are numerous middle schools which have recently been closed down and are now standing unused, these would be a good area to build on or the old project office premises. Not a green open field already close to quite a few housing estates.	The value of this open space to the locality is acknowledged.	Delete the allocation at Policy HV7b.
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Existing local centre sites should be retained. No new local centre sites should be allocated although the type of development at or near the central core of large-scale developments should be of such a style/type that would encourage their use by entrepreneurs seeking to establish local services (e.g. residential development whereby the ground floor could be converted to retail/office use by the existing occupier). To support existing community meeting places, including churches, to expand to accommodate a growing population, developer contributions should be imposed specifically for future extensions/enhancements. New publicly-funded buildings (including those funded under PFI or some other contractual arrangement with a third party provider) should incorporate joint-use community facilities that are guaranteed accessible by way of planning condition.	The suggested mix of uses and principle of of flexible accomodation capable accomodating commercial or residential uses is welcomed, but no explanation is given as to why no further sites should be allocated.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara SurrIDGE				yes	However, see answer to question 3	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15777	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology			no	This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	Not sure whether this comment relates to a particular site or in general.	No changes required
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				yes	But care taken to not be too far from centre	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15867	Mr K Fowler				no	Yes ensure ample car parking space is provided.	Car parking will be proportionate to the development proposed.	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I think there may be a need for more community facilities locally but the other proposals will not be well supported. It is best to concentrate on town centre and sustainable transport links.	The purpose of local centres and facilities is to provide for day to day needs within a comfortable walking distance and provide a focus for a community. Clearly these will need local support to survive. Such facilities would not be a substitute for good town centre facilities and sustainable transport links will still be required.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes	Box ticked yes subject to comments below. Castle Hill Middle School The Corporate Property Division of the County Council supports the identification of the Chivers Road frontage, of the Castle Hill Middle School site, as a potential location for a new local centre to serve the Chivers Road/Strawberry Fields area, generally in accordance with the description set out at paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35. The future uses for this site should be set out in a Development Brief. Corporate Property also considers that the location of the proposed new centre, as indicated on the plan on page 34, should be amended to better accord with the location, and description, as set out at paragraph 5.35 Chalkstone School	Thae changes set out in response to Question 8 relating to Policy HV5d have resulted in the proposed relocation of the allocation. However, it may be possible to accommodate local facilities within that allocation.	No changes required
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		The Corporate Property Division of Suffolk County Council also offers its general support to the identification of the site of the former buildings at Chalkstone Middle School (Policy HV7c)) as having the potential to be developed for community/retail/leisure uses as an adjunct/extension to the existing centre at Strasbourg Square. However, the plans for the Chalkstone School site are at an early stage and the County Council is concerned that there may not be the need, demand, or funding to develop the whole of the site for such purposes. Accordingly, greater flexibility is sought, as to potential future uses, than is currently expressed in paragraph 5.33 of the Vision Statement (see comments relating to Question 10 below).		
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, Objective 6 (unsustainable travel to town centre) building in close proximity to Calford Green, as shown in the document, would not meet this requirement. This point is proved on maps on page 33 and 34 (walking distances to town centre, and distances from local centres).	This response relates to Question 3.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no opinion	For Haverhill residents to decide.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16013	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(b) Any development at this site should retain the bramble present at this site.	It is not now proposed to develop this site.	Delete the allocation at Policy HV7b.
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				Local centres should be designed to encourage sustainable travel for the associated short trips. Location HV7a) should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). HV7b) will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	The site at HV7a) is already allocated as a local centre in the existing adopted Replacement Local Plan. However, this and the site at HV7b) can be fully assessed through the planning application process.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no	this site should be kept as part of the neighbouring conservation area. this area is used for dog walking and recreation there is already a high volume of traffic noise and any form of building would increase this noise. there other sites which could be updated for use as community facilities ie old schools.	Not sure which site this relates to as none are proposed next to a Conservation Area. Suspect it relates to Chivers Road.	Delete the allocation at Policy HV7b.
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	Depends on what is actually being proposed for the Chivers rd site and Hanchet End site. More shops ??	It is not now proposed to develop the site at Chivers Road.	Delete the allocation at Policy HV7b.
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	The plans for Strasbourge Square suggest the existing shops will no longer exist. If that is the plan then what plans are there to accommodate those long established businesses? Chalkstone Middle will eventually, I am sure, become part of a much enlarged Tescos complex. The existing community centres are used very little so emphasis needs to be put on what can they be used for (other than housing).	It is not intended to remove or replace the existing shops. Given its accessible location, the site of the former Chalkstone Middle Schools has been identified as suitable to provide further community facilities. The nature and form of such facilities will need to be the subject of separate planning applications and public consultation.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no	The effect on the surrounding area will be damaged due to probable increase in crime due to increased parked cars and houses. Highway safety - more cars travelling through very small roads near the childrens amenities. Residential amenity in terms of noise, smell, loss of light and overlooking - the light from what is now an open space will be lost. The effect of the proposal upon the enjoyment of our home and garden which is currently not overlooked. Loss of natural habitat for numerous birds and animals, Kestrels, Linets, Wagtails etc.	Suspect that this representation relates to Question 7 in respect of land to the south of Chapelwent Road currently allocated for a school. The nearest proposed local centre site is the existing allocated site to the north of Chapelwent Road and south of Sperling Drive.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 9: New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities (HV7)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with Policy HV7?	Question 9b - If not, please what changes you would like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no	we don't need any more shops when we have just big store round the corner also shops on apple acre rd. this will be back of my house i like the way it is nice greenery.so i think policy hv7 (b) will be waste of money and shame to mess up the filed.	The purpose of the policy is not just to provide shops, but also a range of community facilities which can serve as a focus for a community. However, the value of the open space at Chivers Road/Chimswell Way has been recognised.	Delete the allocation at Policy HV7b.
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	But thank you for the newly open drug counselling centre!	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Removal of the restrictions on the redevelopment of school sites is to be opposed. The existing national policies were introduced for good reason, and do not in themselves prevent redevelopment of all or part of a school site. 5.37(g) and 5.37(h) contradict the proposals contained in 5.22. The rationale against residential development of the School Lane part of this site has been addressed previously. 5.37(i) has already been achieved. 5.37(e) should be subject to comment as a separate strategy as with other proposals for development on previously-developed land, not 'slipped through' as a sub-paragraph of a different section. There is nothing in this section to positively promote the use of brown water recycling, air heat pumps, local energy generation, nor to ensure premises are built incorporating solar energy installations, all of which are positive moves and can be delivered through planning.	Agreed that the existing restrictions on development of school sites should not be removed. The issues relating to water recycling, heat pumps etc are addressed in the sustainability and climate change theme aspiration 2 (paragraph 8.5)	Remove Action b in paragraph 5.37
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	Yes, generally However, the last sentence in 5.30 needs to be reworked - it is insulting at best, and threatening at worst. Get the PC team to look at it and see if it can be worded differently.	This support is welcomed - The Council apologies if this sentence caused any offence.	Amend paragraph 5.30
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	NOT ALL	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15866	Christine Hart					these aspirations are so woolly as to be incontrovertible, motherhood and apple pie, apart from 2) which is cloud cuckoo land. In general we agree with the proposed actions, except for 531G which is unacceptable and 537a and b contradict each other. 537a yes, 537b no.	It is acknowledged that there is a contradiction between action a and b. Action g relates to the changes made at Policy HV5, although it does not allocate the area for a local centre.	Delete Action b and amend Action g to delete reference to a mixed use including residential and a local centre.
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Footpath / cycle path from Chivers Road to School Lane should be directed around Castle playing area at the top of the hill. Former Chalkstone Middle site unnecessary when there is the community centre there already.	Precise routes of footpaths and cycleways will require further consideration. Community uses do not necessarily equate to a community centre. Chalkstone Way is well located to serve a wide town catchment including the town centre.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion	(QUESTION 10 (b) - OBJECTION TO THIS QUESTION) Aspiration 4, Action C Under Aspiration 4; former school sites have been developed to meet the needs of the community, Action 'c' indicates that one of the actions to achieve this is to ensure that sufficient land is included within the north-west Haverhill strategic growth area to accommodate the future requirements for Samuel Ward. Given that a planning application has already been submitted for the north-west development, it is assumed that the wording of this action should read north-east Haverhill rather than north-west Haverhill. If this is the case, the wording of Action 'c' should make specific reference to the fact that any such land included within the new north-east neighbourhood should only relate to the future requirements of the Samuel Ward Academy arising from the proposed new neighbourhood.	The error in action c under paragraph 5.37 is noted. It should read North East Haverhill.	Amend action c to read North East Haverhill

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
						There should not be a requirement for the new north-east neighbourhood to provide expansion land for the Academy as a result of development outside the new neighbourhood.		
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes so long as work with community groups is adopted.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	I do not see how School Lane can be used for access for Castle Hill development. Traffic to schools is already dangerous.	A traffic assessment will be required, but traffic previously serving Castle Hill Middle School particularly at peak times has been removed. It is acknowledged that some of this traffic was not solely associated with the middle school and also served the other schools.	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes	<p>YES BUT SUBJECT TO COMMENTS BELOW</p> <p>The Corporate Property Division of Suffolk County Council generally supports the aspirations for the Castle Hill Middle School and Chalkstone Middle School sites as identified at paragraph 5.32 to 5.37.</p> <p>Castle Hill Middle School (Paras 5.34, 35 & 37) The County Council generally supports the vision identified for the former Castle Hill Middle School site. However, it considers that the relevant paragraph (paras 5.34, 35 & 37) should be amended so that they are consistent with other provisions within the Vision Statement and, in particular, Policy HV 5 and its supporting paragraphs. Accordingly, paras 5.34, 5.35 and 5.37 should be amended in order to make it clear that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing school buildings, the hard surfaced play areas and the adjacent County Maintenance Depot (see response to Question 9 above) are identified for residential development; and that 2. The western part of the site, fronting Chivers Road, is identified as the location for a potential new centre in accordance with Policy HV7b). 	There is a conflict between paragraphs 5.22, 5.35 and 5.37 (g & h) which needs to be addressed relating to Castle Hill Middle School. The recommended option is that identified in paragraph 5.22 and 5.37 (b).	Delete Action b and amend Action g to delete reference to a mixed use including residential and a local centre.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		Chalkstone Middle School (Paras 5.33 and 5.37) As the Borough Council is aware, the County Council has plans to develop approximately two-thirds of the site, comprising the existing school buildings and hard surfaced play areas as they front Millfields Way, as a care home for elderly and those suffering from dementia, with the remaining one-third (i.e. that part of the site of the former school buildings closest to Strasbourg Square) potentially being made available for community/leisure/retail use as an extension of the adjacent centre as Strasbourg Square. However, there has to be some considerable doubt as to whether or not there is both the need, and funding available, for the development of further community uses/leisure/retail uses on the latter part of this site. The County Council has undertaken an extensive public consultation exercise which has established that there is currently no viable community user for this part of the site.	These issues are acknowledged, but do not conflict with the aspirations or actions.	
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		As such, the Corporate Property Division of the County Council is of the view that the Vision Statement should anticipate a 'fallback' position, in case the 'preferred' uses do not come forward during the plan period or, following the development/completion of the care home adjoining (whichever is the earlier). If a viable community user cannot be secured during this period, this part of the site should be developed for housing. There is otherwise a real danger that the land will remain undeveloped (buildings demolished but slab and hardstanding areas remaining), and surrounded by temporary hoardings, so detracting from the amenity of the area for much of the plan period.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		The Corporate Property Division of the County Council suggests that paragraph 5.33 should be replaced with wording along the following lines: 'The former Chalkstone Middle School fronting Millfields Way is a site of 2.75 hectares in a highly accessible location adjacent to Strasbourg Square. The County Council has identified two-thirds of the built part of the school site for the development of a care home for the elderly and for those with dementia. The remaining third of the site is well related to the existing local centre of Strasbourg Square and may be suitable for a range of community/leisure/retail uses. If there proves to be no demand, or need, for such uses, or if the necessary funding does not come forward, following the development/completion of the care home (whichever is the earlier), then this part of the site should be developed for residential purposes.	This wording is far too specific for the Vision document and does not provide the flexibility being sought.	
	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP		The former school playing fields, which occupy the central and south western parts of the site, form a natural extension to the existing open space to the southwest and southeast and should be retained as open space. No development shall take place until a development brief has been approved for the site'	Planning to answer	
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, the last sentence in 5.30 needs to be reworked - it is insulting at best, and threatening at worst. Get the PC team to look at it and see if it can be worded differently.	This support is welcomed - The Council apologises if this sentence caused any offence.	Amend paragraph 5.30

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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 5.31 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 the document should extend the reference to include 'vulnerable people'. Lifetime homes are addressed in the draft Development Management Document.	Amend relevant sections of document to include 'vulnerable people'.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no	No houses should be built on the Castle Hill School site as the traffic congestion is bad enough in this area and the site is more suited to a 2nd cemetery. We do not need anymore shops on this site as we have the Parkway Estate and Premier store near Burn House close as well as Sainsbury and the town all within walking distance.	Proposed changes to Polivy HV5 would relocate development at castle Hill Middle school to Chivers Road, so avoiding the traffic conflict. The need for further cemetery space is acknowledged. Although all shops within the town are technically within walking distance, they are not necessarily within a convenient walking distance, whereby people will choose to walk, rather than use a car.	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Restrictions on school sites should stay. Policy for homes to have brown water recycling, air heat pumps, local energy generation and solar energy installations.	Agreed that the existing restrictions on development of school sites should not be removed. The Council considers that the issue relating to homes and energy generation etc are addressed in the Sustainability and Climate Change Theme (specifically aspirations 2 and 3).	Remove Action b in paragraph 5.37
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	The details you give in section 5.37 (g & h) are contradictory to the details in section 5.22. These need to be clearly explained as to exactly what is being proposed.	There is a conflict between paragraphs 5.22, 5.35 and 5.37 (g & h) which needs to be addressed.	Amend Action g to delete reference to a mixed use including residential and a local centre.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 10: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with our aspirations for homes and communities?	Question 10b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Most definitely not. No further house building on green or agricultural land. Existing school sites to be returned to green field sites or play/allotment type areas to ensure they cannot be built on at a later date.	This is an unrealistic expectation, as there is inadequate brownfield land to meet the housing needs in Haverhill. See changes above relating to the removal of action b under 5.37. There is no reasoned justification to prevent the redevelopment of the built up area of school sites.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	No	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	The town has changed too much in the last ten years (not for the better)	Noted	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	Yes, but the Town needs more linked up sustainable foot/cycle paths. The only main route in the town along the railway line does not even link to the newest housing estates.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The concentration of employment to the east and south-east, while positively separating business and residential developments, is not conducive to reducing use of cars for home to work journeys. There needs to be reference to small-scale 'live above the office/workshop' type properties on all new proposals for large-scale residential development.	The separation of large scale employment from residential areas can have implications for sustainable travel, but sustainable links can still be provided. Paragraph 16.4 of the document does make provision for B1 employment opportunities within the strategic growth area. This could be achieved by including small scale live above the office/workshop type properties.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	Yes However, the title to the map should be placed more appropriately. At first it reads as if all employment areas will surround Calford Green.	Noted	Check annotation on map
HVR15777	Jess Tipper				no	No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Noted	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Not All. More emphasis on travelling and delivery time for businesses (cheaper and greener solutions)	Policy HV8 identifies the strategic locations for employment development. Applications for development will need to comply with policies contained within the draft Development Management Document relating to transport assessments and travel plans. However, travel can be added to the policy considerations.	Add travel to the list of considerations in Policy HV8
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes	Please do not allow further development on greenfield sites.	There are insufficient brownfield sites to meet the employment needs of Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes, I also believe the upgrading of the A1307 will help and the A1017 would also be useful but at a very high cost.	Noted. This matter is addressed through the Local Transport Plan at paragraph 7.2 of this document.	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, the title to the map should be placed more appropriately. At first it reads as if all employment areas will surround Calford Green.	Thank you for your observations	Check annotation on map.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). There needs to be a proportionate increase in business premises and employment opportunities to meet the aspirations of local people and the current population, plus a modest growth. Any increases beyond this is likely to lead to the provision of jobs for people who do not live in the Borough. This would only encourage them to move to the Borough placing additional pressure on housing and the general infrastructure.	At present there is significant outward commuting from Haverhill. Additional employment opportunities within the town should help address this flow. However, employment opportunities cannot be restricted to residents of Haverhill.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council has no objection in principle to development, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. We would further suggest that this policy ought to refer to 'travel', in addition to parking, as one of the requirements to be met in order for development to take place.	Noted. Travel can be added to the list of considerations.	Add travel to the list of considerations in Policy HV8
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	To include roads and cycleways leading to the industrial estate from North East Haverhill	These are a requirement in paragraph 16.4	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	Generally yes but there will never be a skilled workforce in Haverhill when the quality of the teaching / exam results are so poor considering the type of schools we have. Aspirations for youngsters mostly tend to revolve around the beauty or media businesses with very few actually obtaining further qualifications that businesses really want.	This is a generalisation which is not supported by evidence. Both Upper Schools are rated as excellent.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	One in three local children receive free school meals because of low incomes and the fact that there are no jobs available locally. Having commuted to Cambridge for four years and Bury for two years myself, both roads are busy and it is very expensive. There is also a high casualty rate. More houses than jobs makes it worse!	The purpose of this policy is facilitate further employment growth to redress the balance of homes and employment.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 11: General Employment Areas (HV8)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with Policy HV8?	Question 11b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	The town needs appropriate jobs to support it. Probably more manufacturing jobs and also some public sector / local authority / government jobs would be good. Bury St Edmunds seems to have more that it's share !!	Noted. A wide range of employment opportunities is encouraged. The employment figures for Bury St Edmunds were identified by the Western Suffolk Employment Land Review.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surrige				yes	Yes, However, there should be a specific statement (either here or in the masterplan) that the landscaping aspects of this area (Hanchett End) should have a high profile so that a key approach to Haverhill is attractive and welcoming.	The adopted masterplan does already contain this provision.	No changes required
HVR15777	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.	The site already has planning consent and archaeological investigation is currently being carried out.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15857	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Carisbrooke fully supports the allocation of the site as a strategic development site, however it is disappointed that Policy HV9 does not accurately reflect the site's current planning position in terms of the planning permissions granted in January this year for the development of Haverhill Research Park. The development is being strongly supported by a variety of individuals and organisations including the Borough Council's Economic Development Officer, Suffolk County Council, the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce, Haverhill Enterprise, Anglia Ruskin University and University Campus Suffolk to name just a few. In addition to this support the Borough Council and Carisbrooke Investments have recently submitted joint bids to the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP) and to the New Anglia LEP for funding from the Growing Places Fund.	Agreed that a consistent approach to naming is required.	Refer to the employment site at Hanchett End as Haverhill Research Park.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		<p>New Anglia LEP has subsequently confirmed that the project is deemed eligible for consideration for support and it will therefore be subject to further appraisal and due diligence work before a final decision is made. GCGP LEP has not yet made a decision, but the signs are all hopeful.</p> <p>For clarity, and to assist stakeholders we would like to see consistency in all references to the site throughout the Haverhill Vision 2031 document. This would also complement Carisbrooke's current marketing campaign because the 'Haverhill Research Park' name and logo is registered with the Association of Business Parks and accordingly, it is being used extensively for marketing purposes. We welcome the reference at paragraph 6.7(d) of the Haverhill Vision document to 'Haverhill Research Park' but maps on p24, 39 and 69 of the same document, in respect of strategic site allocations, all refer to 'Hanchett End Research Park' whilst (even more confusingly), Policy HV9 refers to 'Hanchett End Business Park'.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		The use of three different names within the same document is confusing and suggests that the sites are different. To avoid any confusion, we would like to see all references to the site in the Haverhill Vision document using the 'Haverhill Research Park' title. We are also disappointed to note that Policy HV9 is simply a reworked version of the wording used within the Council's Concept Statement (from September 2010) except that it now includes only B1 uses; it also refers to 'Hanchett End Business Park' (as discussed above); and inserting the word 'or' after part b is clearly incorrect. Additionally, reference to the adopted Masterplan for the site seems to be an afterthought and infers that is not very relevant as it will soon 'expire'. In addition, it seems to us, and our client, that the whole emphasis of the policy is generally unsupportive of the Haverhill Research Park development, especially given that the project is the subject of four extant planning permissions.		
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		While we understand that Policy HV9 forms part of a long term 'vision' document, and that if the Haverhill Research Park development does not go ahead, then the Council would need to 'fall-back' on its strategic employment site policy, in the current economic circumstances we firmly believe that the policy should be as positive as possible in order to help promote businesses to come to Haverhill. Accordingly, to ensure that Policy HV9 is justified and effective, we would ask that it is re-worded as follows:		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		<p>'POLICY HV9: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION - HANCHET END, HAVERHILL</p> <p>12 hectares of land at Hanchet End, Haverhill are allocated as a strategic development site, primarily for employment purposes within Class B1 of the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).</p> <p>The site is to be known as the 'Haverhill Research Park' and, following the granting of several planning permissions in January 2012, the development of the site will comprise the following:</p> <p>a). 7.9ha of land for a new business/research park, comprising units for new firms involved in high technology, research and development and related activities;</p> <p>b). 3.34ha of land for residential uses (up to 150 dwellings), and;</p> <p>c). 0.61ha of land for supporting commercial uses, which may comprise a public house/restaurant, hotel and crèche.</p> <p>The site will provide an impressive 'gateway' development to Haverhill comprising a high quality business/research park within an attractive, well landscaped environment.'</p>	The proposed wording for the policy reflects the adopted Masterplan, however, the Masterplan is time limited taking account of the current economic situation and including an element of residential development as an exception to policy to act as enabling development. Should the the residential development be included within the policy, and the current planning permission is not implemented, the residential element will lose its enabling status and be required to meet all other policy requirements including the provision of 30% affordable housing. The inclusion of all other elements could be regarded as too prescriptive and restrictive for this level of policy. These elements have been arrived at following detailed analysis in the current market during the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I think that having this development right on the entrance road to Haverhill is not the best place - not in keeping with countryside.	This site has been identified for commercial development as a gateway site since the 1970s. Its prominent position has always been recognised and a high standard of development is a requirement.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes - My only concern would be the additional traffic on the A1307. Traffic turning right as it exits the development. It will also need to create a good impression as traffic approaches Haverhill.	This is a matter for detailed consideration with a planning application.	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15884	Mr R Maidment			Haverhill Chamber of Commerce				
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council				It is felt that the residential development on the Hanchett End site should have its' own separate road for ingress and egress. During rush hour periods those arriving or leaving the business park will be in conflict with those arriving or leaving the houses.	This is a matter for detailed consideration with a planning application.	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	However, there should be a specific statement (either here or in the masterplan) that the landscaping aspects of this area (Hanchett End) should have a high profile so that a key approach to Haverhill is attractive and welcoming.	The adopted masterplan does already contain this provision.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). There needs to be a proportionate increase in business premises and employment opportunities to meet the aspirations of local people and the current population, plus a modest growth. Any increases beyond this is likely to lead to the provision of jobs for people who do not live in the Borough. This would only encourage them to move to the Borough placing additional pressure on housing and the general infrastructure.	At present there is significant outward commuting from Haverhill. Additional employment opportunities within the town should help address this flow. However, employment opportunities cannot be restricted to residents of Haverhill.	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council welcomes this allocation of employment land, and hopes to see it developed to fruition soon. It will, however, require an agreed traffic assessment and a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any full planning consent.	Noted. These matters have been addressed through the planning application process.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes	Am very worried about the impact of the new access road joining the roundabout road and also the impact on peak time traffic.	This is a matter for detailed consideration with a planning application.	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	This is about the only good bit in the whole Vision statement that someone has spent some time thinking about.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			no	I agree in principle with the plan but would not like to see an over development of Haverhill Retail Park at the expense of the town centre	This strategic site does not include any retail element.	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	there should be a specific statement (either here or in the masterplan) that the landscaping aspects of this area (Hanchett End) should have a high profile so that a key approach to Haverhill is attractive and welcoming.	The adopted masterplan does already contain this provision.	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 12: Hanchet End (HV9)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with Policy HV9?	Question 12b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader					The town needs appropriate jobs to support it. Probably more manufacturing jobs and also some public sector / local authority / government jobs would be good. Bury St Edmunds seems to have more than its share !!	Noted. A wide range of employment opportunities is encouraged. The employment figures for Bury St Edmunds were identified by the Western Suffolk Employment Land Review.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 13: Haverhill and Ehringshausen Way Retail Park (HV10)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with Policy HV10?	Question 13b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	There is a requirement for large retail space to attract high volume retailers. The scheme already proposed for Ehringshausen Way also includes start-up units and small warehouse units. The Vision should include this use on the site, which is contiguous with other light industry/large retail uses. Amongst others, the site offers an opportunity to attract shoppers who might otherwise use other major towns or out of town providers. Additional shoppers here may also use the High Street.	The allocation for Ehringshausen Way reflects closely the retail element identified in the existing planning permission and does not extend to the whole Project Site. The start-up commercial units and industrial/warehouse units sit within the area identified as General Employment Area.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				no	Why was this brownfield site (Project site) not allocated to 'near town centre housing', or to office/house combines, or to small units with housing over?	The position of the site surrounded by operational unrestricted industrial units and the sewage works makes it unsuitable for housing.	No changes required
HVR15777	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.	Noted. The planning permission for the site contains the relevant condition.	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Should be residential	The position of the site surrounded by operational unrestricted industrial units and the sewage works makes it unsuitable for housing.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 13: Haverhill and Ehringshausen Way Retail Park (HV10)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with Policy HV10?	Question 13b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I think this should be developed for housing and retail units made available in former Addis factory and Chauntry Mills. Keep everything central to the town, not spread out.	The position of the site surrounded by operational unrestricted industrial units and the sewage works makes it unsuitable for housing. The sites referred to may be able to accommodate further retail provision, but there is a need for bulky goods retail premises which cannot be accommodated within the town centre.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council				Careful thought should be given to the redevelopment of the Project Site. The wrong and inappropriate use could detract from the offer of the town centre.	Agreed. Any retail use should complement rather than compete with the town centre.	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no	Why was this brownfield site (Project site) not allocated to 'near town centre housing', or to office/house combines, or to small units with housing over?	The position of the site surrounded by operational unrestricted industrial units and the sewage works makes it unsuitable for housing.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 13: Haverhill and Ehringshausen Way Retail Park (HV10)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with Policy HV10?	Question 13b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no opinion	For the residents of Haverhill to decide.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 13: Haverhill and Ehringshausen Way Retail Park (HV10)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with Policy HV10?	Question 13b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				HV10 South (Ehringhausen Way/Stour Valley Road) will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. We welcome the consideration of accessibility by a variety of means of transport in part d), though we wonder whether that clause ought to refer to 'sustainable' transport, unless that consideration is covered by the hierarchy of transport options set out in Core Strategy policy CS7. There should also be reference to a transport assessment and site travel plan. In order not to negatively impact on the town High Street, consideration should be given to improving connectivity between the High St and new development off Ehringhausen Way.	Noted. The archaeological condition is already in place. The hierarchy referred to in the Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy will apply to all forms of development and does not need to be repeated.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes	I agree in principle with the plan but would not like to see an over development of Haverhill Retail Park at the expense of the town centre	Agreed. Any retail use should complement rather than compete with the town centre.	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Will this ever happen? It has been talked about for years.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 13: Haverhill and Ehringshausen Way Retail Park (HV10)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with Policy HV10?	Question 13b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	This site would be ideal for housing because it is close to the town centre, where people can sustainably get to the services like shops. It should not be a retail site. Haverhill has enough room in the high street to accommodate major new retailers.	The position of the site surrounded by operational unrestricted industrial units and the sewage works makes it unsuitable for housing. There is a need for bulky goods retail premises which cannot be accommodated within the town centre.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Haverhill has few low skill employment opportunities and training opportunities for service sector employment is not locally available. With the loss of financial inducements to remain in education or training young NEETS need affordable reliable transport to enable them to take advantage of training and opportunities in larger towns. West Suffolk College has a presence and facilities to deliver their opportunities locally would benefit our young people. A 'Haverhill Campus' would be a substantial move towards this. Vacant space on the industrial estates could be adapted to provide local training opportunities. Publicly awarded contracts should require a commitment to employment of local residents. The use of planning policies might influence the type of new employment opportunities. Although Haverhill has been successful in attracting new employers to the town over the past ten years, too many have offered process-type opportunities, lowly-paid, and often unskilled.	The Haverhill Vision 2031 document seeks to broaden employment opportunities across all sectors. In addition, a site for a further education facility has been identified at Hollands Road/Duddery Hill. This location is accessible from all parts of the town, by a variety of means of transport, and well sited to serve the needs of existing employment areas and the town centre.	No changes required
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				A Neighbourhood Development Order approach on part of some employment areas could restrict new employers to those offering a different range of opportunities.	A Neighbourhood Development Order can only restrict use classes. As such it would be a blunt tool likely to restrict all employment opportunities rather than encourage specific opportunities.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	(though one does get weary of aspirations seldom coming to fruition!)	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	This, and other questions re 'Aspirations' () need comment. This week I attended a Focus Group to discuss 'Aspirations'. This week's Echo shows archive material showing that the very same things were being discussed 25 years ago. AND a TV programme shows that Eldon Griffiths, MP and William Gurteen were discussing the same things 40 years ago. Much money is spent discussing aspirations and this will only be cost effective if there is a marriage between aspiration, planning and outcome	This representation identifies part of the need for this document, which seeks to pull these elements together.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	Yes who wouldnt. except that 6.4b requires a higher profile throughout this entire document because people will continue to work in Cambridge, especially with the vast expansion going on at Addenbrookes which does not even feature in this document.	Noted - the issue of good transport links are also raised in the travel section of the document.	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	I do not agree that we need a separate sixth form site. This should be developed within current schools. A technical college would be preferable in Haverhill, perhaps close to the industrial estate.	This issue is considered under question 29. The proposed facility is intended to meet further education requirements rather than a specific sixth form centre. This would not prevent schools developing sixth form facilities within their own sites, but would protect the Hollands Road site from any other form of development.	Amend paragraph 6.16 to refer to a sixth form/further education facility.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	(though one does get weary of aspirations seldom coming to fruition!)	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). There needs to be a proportionate increase in business premises and employment opportunities to meet the aspirations of local people and the current population, plus a modest growth. Any increases beyond this is likely to lead to the provision of jobs for people who do not live in the Borough. This would only encourage them to move to the Borough placing additional pressure on housing and the general infrastructure.	The proposed growth in employment provision is an essential part of the future development of Haverhill and will provide significant opportunities for employment growth. However, employment provision is not the only influence on housing demand and pressure for housing from outside the Borough cannot be ignored or dismissed.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				It may be worth expanding point h) of paragraph 6.7 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 play in economic development. Aspiration 3 refers to Haverhill being seen to be hard working etc. Therefore the actions referred to in 6.15 might be improved through reference to promotion of that reputation, perhaps via the CB9 branding and or Haverhill's growing connection to Cambridge and its hinterland.	It is agreed that the actions in 6.7 need to be reviewed.	Review all actions listed in paragraph 6.7

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
						The borough council will be very aware of the difficulties of delivering employment land. 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 contribute.		
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	With Vion downsizing low skill jobs should be encouraged. Vocational work and "Haverhill Campus" should be inserted.	The jobs lost at Vion were skilled jobs. There is a need to cater for all sectors. This applies to the employment section (Aspiration2) and the education section (Aspiration 5).	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Encourage more manufacturing businesses and/or more apprenticeships rather than expecting every youngster to continue in full time education and obtain a worthless degree.	Noted - the Council's approach to economic growth includes the targetting of advanced manufacturing and bio-tech. The vision also supports the expansion of apprenticeships.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 14: Jobs and the Economy aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our aspirations for jobs and the economy?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	Expansion to employment sites naturally means unacceptable expansion in residential sites	Disagree. Haverhill already experiences significant out-commuting and employment growth can help to redress this situation.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				yes	But we will have more houses than jobs and still poor roads.	Noted -the issue of roads is considered in the travel section of the document	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	Yes, although the assumption that Haverhill will attract enough business investment to supply sufficient training and apprentice opportunities for young people might be unrealistic.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	No. Jobs should be increased to match the requirement for the existing population before any new housing built in the wrong place.	This response relates primarily to housing growth and its location.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 15: Northern Relief Road (HV11)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with Policy HV11?	Question 15b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15777	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	Noted	No changes required
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	The cycle travel time from housing to town centre, 10 minutes, is realistic - It's downhill!. Return times, if with shopping, would be much longer (uphill) and this would therefore deter many from setting out by cycle in the first place. There should be proper lockable provision for cycles in the town centre.	Noted. The map is an extract from the Suffolk Local Transport Plan and is used for illustrative purposes only. It does not take account of topography or other physical constraints. Secure provision for cycles in the town centre would encourage cycle use.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Disagree with map, cannot simply draw a circle around and expect to cycle at same speed whichever way. We have undulating terrain locally and the proposed 10 minute cycle to the centre will take 25 minutes from points on the east	Noted. The map is an extract from the Suffolk Local Transport Plan and is used for illustrative purposes only. It does not take account of topography or other physical constraints.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Yes maintain tree line please.	Substantial tree planting will be required.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 15: Northern Relief Road (HV11)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with Policy HV11?	Question 15b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). Final approval of the scheme and details to be approved by the people of Haverhill.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 15: Northern Relief Road (HV11)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with Policy HV11?	Question 15b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The provision of a road on the outer edge of the north-west development has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact on the Cangle junction. An internal distributor road may also be appropriate, providing sufficient capacity could be accommodated. The policy refers to developers implementing this proposal or making appropriate financial contribution towards its completion. This raises two potential problems. A contribution would not ensure any level of mitigation for the proposed development and there may be issues securing the full financial contribution required to enable the scheme to be delivered. Alternative non-development funding sources are limited and could not be relied upon. Consideration needs to be given to the wording of this policy. Development will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation relating to any planning consent.	Noted. These are issues which are being addressed through the planning application process.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 15: Northern Relief Road (HV11)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with Policy HV11?	Question 15b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	,	This option was considered at the Core Strategy examination, but the need could not be substantiated.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	Inevitable future inclusion of Little Wrating with Haverhill	Part of the route of the road lies within the parish of Little Wrating, but it should define the edge of the urban area, separating it from the hamlet of Little Wrating.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	To much traffic along Wrating road, Withersfield road and Ehringshausen Way due to Tescos and the Cinema complex	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	Yes but the relief road should continue as planned completing the Haverhill ring road network / infrastructure.	Observations are noted	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				no	I support the proposed allocations in Haverhill Vision, which in my view have the broad support of the community. However, Haverhill Vision has two gaps: a) the A1307 and b) the High Street. While these are not entirely Borough matters, the backing of the Borough for their resolution is vital. The A1307, and other roads to and from Haverhill, are mentioned but there is no explicit aim to work to improving external transport links. Improving the A1307, at first around Linton, and eventually along its entire route to the M11, is vital for the long term health of the town. Haverhill suffers from being disconnected from the dual carriageway network, and any vision for 2031 must rectify this. I certainly hope it will have been done by then.	The A1307 is an important and significant issue which does need to be addressed for the benefit of Haverhill and the villages along its route. This needs to be explored further by the ongoing collaborative work of all of the authorities involved. The issue of Haverhill High Street is addressed in the Haverhill Town Centre aspiration.	
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Cross town traffic routes, both North/South and East/West, are urgently required to reduce congestion, improve public transport and enable safer routes for cyclists and pedestrians. Many years of ignoring car use have had no impact on traffic growth, attempts to abate car use by cost measures have failed, improvements in public transport have been equally ineffective as deregulation has escalated its cost. The only strategy that has succeeded is to inconvenience car users - restricted parking, pedestrianisation and road charging. 7.12(d) proposes increasing the number of crossing points on the main A143 through the town. Further level (as distinct to bridges/underpasses) crossing points, particularly if light-controlled, will have an impact on traffic flows on this main arterial route. There is nothing in the policy regarding providing secure, undercover, town centre cycle storage/parking facilities.	The thrust of these aspirations is to provide credible alternatives th the use of the motor car within the town, rather than just to penalise the motorist. However, this may require pedestrian/cycle priorities which will affect motorists, particularly where crossing points are required. Aspiration 1e does already require secure, covered bus shelters, but does not restrict them to the town centre.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council				There is nothing in the policy, other than a fast bus service to Cambridge, about contributions from developers to improvements on the A1307. 7.15(c) talks of improving the size and facilities at the bus station, and of encouraging people to combine different forms of transport there, all of which seems to refer to previous attempts to provide 'kiss and ride' facilities so that our residents could be dropped off before making their longer journeys out of town. Not only has the bus station only just been refurbished and redesigned, but most commuters join the bus near their homes, as the Cambridge bus plies its circuitous route around town - getting the car out to travel to the bus station isn't an option.	The A1307 is an important and significant issue which does need to be addressed for the benefit of Haverhill and the villages along its route. This needs to be explored further by the ongoing collaborative work of all of the authorities involved. We are seeking to improve bus services to make it a viable and realistic alternative.	
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Do not agree with aspirations and actions because they are inadequate. A further aspiration no. 4 should be added to require the provision of country parkland for a town the size Haverhill will become, to reduce car journeys of Haverhill families to the nearest country parkland. The third largest town in Suffolk requires its own country parkland.	The Green Infrastructure Study referred to in Chapter 14 includes opportunities for new parkland. In addition, the strategic areas of growth will be required to contribute further areas of open space.	No changes required
HVR15847	Shaun Hazlewood				no	The A1307, the main road to Cambridge is already very busy and extremely dangerous with no further plans to increase its capacity. It must be improved before you can consider building this many houses. It's just not realistic to expect that you will create enough additional jobs on the new business park to keep the majority of new residents within Haverhill. I believe the new estate will result in a massive increase in traffic onto an already bursting road network.	It is acknowledged that the A1307 is a major issue which needs to be addressed. This requires working with partners outside the borough as identified at paragraph 7.2. However, simply increasing the capacity of the road could fuel further car borne movements and increase pressure for further growth. Further options as detailed in Aspiration 2 need to be explored.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	The cycle travel time from housing to town centre, 10 minutes, is realistic - It's downhill!. Return times, if with shopping, would be much longer (uphill) and this would therefore deter many from setting out by cycle in the first place. There should be proper lockable provision for cycles in the town centre.	Noted. This is an issue which will need to be addressed in conjunction with the formulation of the town centre masterplan.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	Disagree with map, cannot simply draw a circle around and expect to cycle at same speed whichever way. We have undulating terrain locally and the proposed 10 minute cycle to the centre will take 25 minutes from points on the east What about rail link?	The map is an extract from the Suffolk Local transport Plan and is based on averages for a given distance. It is acknowledged that times will vary between individuals and according to terrain. A rail link is not precluded by aspiration 2.	
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	Aspiration 1 is cloud cuckoo land because of geography. 7.15d and e should be the highest priority and further action should continue throughout the plan period towards the restoration of the rail link that was removed just prior to the first expansion of the town. Aspiration 3 is vital but no actions are proposed to progress it.	Aspiration 1 is challenging, but that is not a reason for not including it. 7.15 does not preclude a rail link. There is no hierarchy to the actions, but action d could be moved to become action a. Aspiration 3 does require actions to progress it.	Move action d in paragraph 7.15 to position a. Add actions to support Aspiration 3.
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Yes - Asp 1 No - Asp 2 Aspiration 2 needs to include Bury St Edmunds Aspiration 3 - Perhaps include car share facilities in the town.	Agree that fast links are also needed to Bury St Edmunds.	Add Bury St Edmunds to action d in paragraph 7.15 and move to position a (as detailed above)
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes	Yes - How about a tram up and down Wratting Road?	A tram is unlikely to be cost effective or flexible enough to meet local requirements.	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). They need to be modified. Significantly increasing the Boroughs population 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. 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 expansion plans. 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 or others for major improvements. Many towns have been expanded without infrastructure improvements, with disastrous effect.	Noted	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough 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.	This is not a realistic proposition. There is no public funding to provide the infrastructure ahead of development. New development will be required to provide proportionate funding for, or provide the necessary infrastructure.	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council sees transport as playing an important part in the sustainable growth of Haverhill, and LTP3 aims to support sustainable development in the town. Given the growing importance of Haverhill within the Cambridge hinterland, a priority must be to improve transport links with Cambridge. We will continue to work with you and Cambridgeshire authorities to achieve improvements to the A1307. It is also important to provide high quality public transport options, and Vision 2031 ought to include investigation of fixed public transport routes as an action for both the borough and county councils. SCC agrees with and supports the Haverhill Vision 2031 travel aspirations. In particular, we welcome the commitment to improving pedestrian and cycle links. We will work with employers and local public sector organisations to introduce travel plans where possible.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The need for cycle parking has been identified within the LTP programme, however, in the shorter term, funding for new cycle storage facilities will need to come from employers and public sector establishments. junctions to enable the traffic to be managed Haverhill is identified as a strategic town within the councils Local Transport Plan. Funding has therefore been provided over the period of 2011-15 to improve cycle routes, widen footways, improve pedestrian access and the High Street. However, where improvements relate to development sites the expectation is that the facilities will be provided or be part funded by the development.		
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				Haverhill currently has a reasonable commercial bus service to Cambridge operated by Stagecoach. In order for the frequency to be increased, or services to be radically altered (e.g. change of the manor of provision to a guided bus-way), discussions would need to take place between the operator, SCC and CCC as the relevant Passenger Transport Authorities, and the prospective developers in both Cambridge and Haverhill. Haverhill also has access to fairly regular commercial bus services to Sudbury, Clare, Hundon and Bury St. Edmunds from Monday to Saturday during the daytime and also has access to a town circular bus service providing 5 circular journeys per day between Monday and Saturday. Again, discussions would need to take place between the relevant parties before routes could be altered to accommodate residents in new developments.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				At times when they are not in danger of duplicating the journeys made by commercial bus services, and in instances where people need a public transport service that can more easily accommodate any physical disabilities they have, residents also have access to the Suffolk Links Three Towns DRT service to travel from the town to rural areas within its area of operation. This is a well established service which Suffolk County Council aims to continue to support. SCC anticipates that there is potential for the insertion of an urban traffic management system in Haverhill that will give priority to buses, this will require signalisation of key	The Council welcomes these comments and will make reference to the Suffolk Links service in the document.	
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				no	there is nothing in these aspirations for the need of a Haverhill train station . connection to the rail network.	A rail link is not precluded by aspiration 2.	No change required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Cross town traffic routes are urgently required to reduce congestion and stop rat-runs though housing estates. Cycle route from North East Haverhill to the Industrial Estate.	Improvements to cycle routes have been identified. In addition, aspiration 2, action d makes it clear that primary road networks are safeguarded. The proposal for a northern relief road will help to reduce congestion.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes	But some of the cycle paths are extremely narrow and also cause conflict when walking a dog or pushing a buggy, when a cyclist also wants to ride the same path.	Noted. Where a cycle path is shared with a footpath, it is essential that it is wide enough to accommodate both without conflict.	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Why is there no support for any sort of rail transport?	A rail link is not precluded by aspiration 2.	See comment above
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes	Obviously more people should be encouraged to walk or cycle	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 16: Travel aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our aspirations for travel?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Having commuted to Cambridge for four years and Bury for two years myself, both roads are busy and it is very expensive. There is also a high casualty rate. In 20 years time we will have more houses and the roads will still be the same but with more traffic on.	There is no suggestion that the roads will remain unchanged.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	Yes, but both while the Northern Relief Road will facilitate communication between NW Haverhill expansion plans both the A1307 and the A143 will remain inadequate to cope with increased traffic and these will be the main arteries conducting the majority of the population of Haverhill to their places of work in or near Cambridge and Bury St Edmunds.	It is acknowledged that the A1307 is a major issue which needs to be addressed. This requires working with partners outside the borough as identified at paragraph 7.2. The same issues do not apply to the A143, although any improvements required will be incorporated into the Sufflok Local transport Plan.	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	Support proposals to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists & to promote active travel. Safety issues should also be considered particularly for older people and the very young.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	To reduce carbon emissions greater than the Government Targets, then PPG13 Transport should be followed. Our quality of life depends on transport and easy access to jobs. The location of housing is vital in reducing the need for people to travel, especially by car. It is not practical to expect significant numbers of people to walk or cycle without suitable infrastructure to support it. Also - not likely that most new occupants will travel to workplace by bus or guided bus either. If this expansion goes ahead, then Haverhill needs dual carriageway to Cambridge because imposing 50 mph speed limit is not going to increase quality of lives of the Haverhill working population. The previous Cambridge sub regional study, "Buchanan" report, September 2001, concluded that where the jobs/housing imbalance is excessive there clearly need to be efforts to address that before further population expansion, e.g. the Haverhill corridor.	PPG 13 has been superseded by the NPPF. Simply increasing the capacity of the A1307 could fuel further car borne movements and increase pressure for further growth. Further options as detailed in Aspiration 2 need to be explored.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	This is a very weak policy, and the Policy should set out the minimum requirements for new (50+) residential developments - brown water recycling, solar energy units on all roofs, air heat pumps as standard on all houses.	For a policy to be effective, it needs to be enforceable. At present, there is no legislative backup to support this policy. Furthermore, the choice of 50+ houses appears arbitrary and would not affect many new developments. Technology is constantly changing and the requirements suggested may not be appropriate. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	Semantics!! Building houses is fundamentally not sustainable!! The use of the resources can never be replaced.	Even accepting this argument, 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 HV12

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				This policy could perhaps benefit from further detail as to what the council expects from new development, in terms of the amount of carbon to be reduced or even a requirement that development proves that renewable/low carbon energy generation is not viable or acceptable, in line with the proactive approach set out in the NPPF.	This is the approach which has been adopted in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Policy very weak, should have minimum requirements for new 50+ residential developments-brown water recycling, solar energy units on all roofs and air heat pumps on all houses.	For a policy to be effective, it needs to be enforceable. At present, there is no legislative backup to support this policy. Furthermore, the choice of 50+ houses appears arbitrary and would not affect many new developments. Technology is constantly changing and the requirements suggested may not be appropriate. More focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	If you agree that there is such a thing as human generated global warming and not that it is just part of natures cycle.	This support is welcomed. Whether global warming is human generated or part of a natural cycle, the supply of fossil fuels is finite.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				yes	The local buses are very old, leak when it rains and noisy and should have been replaced 10 years ago.	This support is welcomed. For public transport to be seen as an attractive alternative to the car the situation with the buses needs to be resolved. However, this fall outside the scope of this document.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed. However, more focussed policies have been developed in the draft Development Management Policies document which supersede this policy.	Delete Policy HV12
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 17: On-site Low Carbon energy Target (HV12)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with Policy HV12?	Question 17b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	To reduce carbon emissions greater than the Government Targets, then PPG13 Transport should be followed. Our quality of life depends on transport and easy access to jobs. The location of housing is vital in reducing the need for people to travel, especially by car. It is not practicle to expect significant numbers of people to walk or cycle without suitable infrastructure to support it. Also - not likely that most new occupants will travel to workplace by bus or guided bus either. If this exapnsion goes ahead, then Haverhill needs dual carridgeway to Cambridge because imposing 50 mph speed limit is not going to increase quality of lives of the Haverhill working population. The previous Cambridge sub regional study, "Buchanan" report, September 2001, concluded that where the jobs/housing imbalance is excessive there clearly need to be efforts to address that before further population expansion, e.g. the Haverhill corridor.	Conversely, the construction of a dual carriageway to Cambridge will encourage more car borne trips and make Haverhill more attractive as a commuter town for Cambridge, adding to congestion at either end of the dual carriageway and increasing demand for further house building. PPG13 has been superseded by the NPPF.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 18: District Heating (HV13)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with Policy HV13?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	As worded 'It is a recommendation' this is NOT a policy. Incorporating the words 'feasible and financially viable' enable a developer too much 'wriggle room'. Either this is to be a strict planning condition for all developments that are, in whole, or as a part of, (say) 1,000 residential units, or it should not appear as a Policy, merely a (vain) aspiration.	The policy would be strengthened by changing 'recommended' to 'required'. 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.	Amend Policy HV13
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara SurrIDGE				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPi	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				no	I agree that any wasted heat should be used where financially viable but don't agree with district heating.	No explanation is given as to why district heating is specifically opposed.	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 18: District Heating (HV13)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with Policy HV13?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion	Do not understand what 'District Heating' is.	Thank you for responding. District heating is a system for distributing heat generated in a centralized location for residential and commercial heating requirements.	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 18: District Heating (HV13)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with Policy HV13?	Question 18b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The aims of policy HV13 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).	It is agreed that the policy could be strengthened as detailed in response to HV15722 above	Amend Policy HV13
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Recommendation should be changed to policy and take out "feasible and financially viable" should be a strict planning condition for over 1,000 residential houses.	It is agreed that 'feasible and financially viable' should be removed from the policy, but there is no rationale for limiting the requirement to development of over 1,000 houses. The policy can also be applied to commercial premises.	Amend Policy HV13
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	jagtar rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes	Sounds fantastic and sensible	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	New large scale developments should make use of Geothermal energy.	If feasible, this could be explored	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 19: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (HV14)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with Policy HV14?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Should include provision for CIL and Allowable Solutions funds/resources to be allocated exclusively for the benefit of the neighbourhood where it is raised. If unable to be spent within the lifetime of the Vision should be able to be either carried forward (if Vision 2041 has similar aims) or invested in alternative energy/resource reduction measures identified jointly by the Council and the community.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	Amend policy to refer to forthcoming CIL protocol and Allowable solutions SPD
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara SurrIDGE				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 19: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (HV14)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with Policy HV14?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no opinion	Need more information in order to make informed input	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 19: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (HV14)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with Policy HV14?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	Amend policy to refer to forthcoming CIL protocol and Allowable solutions SPD
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	The money should be spent in Haverhill, to reduce energy.	Further research will be conducted as the council prepares its CIL charging schedule.	Amend policy to refer to forthcoming CIL protocol and Allowable solutions SPD
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	jagtar rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 19: Community Infrastructure Levy and Allowable Solutions (HV14)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with Policy HV14?	Question 19b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	but, what are the other CO2 reduction priorities ?	These will be the subject of further research and are likely to change with new technologies. However, they could be given greater emphasis by changing the priorities within the policy.	Amend Policy HV14 to change emphasis to energy efficiency and carbon reduction projects.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Aspirations are acceptable, but not supported by more positive directed planning policies.	Further policy requirements are contained in the drft Development Management Policies document which should be read alongside the Vision 2031 document	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				no opinion	I am still trying to work out what the actual question is!	Noted	No changes required
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	Semantics!! Building houses is fundamentally not sustainable!!. The use of the resources can never be replaced.	Even accepting this argument, 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.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion	(QUESTION 20 (b) - OBJECTION TO THIS QUESTION) Aspiration 1, Action B Aspiration 1; resource efficiency is maximised and carbon emissions are reduced at a rate greater than Government targets, sets out Action 'b' which seeks to require developers to take account of the lifetime impact of their development on the local community and the environment when submitting proposals. It is considered that additional wording should be added to this Action indicating that the Council will provide guidance on the way in which this will be assessed. This will provide clarity and consistency when assessing the impact of developments.	The means to achieve this are included in the draft Development Management Policies document, which sets out specific targets. Given these emerging policies aspiration 1 and action 1b are no longer required.	Delete aspiration 1 and action 1b
						Aspiration 3; Action A Aspiration 3 which seeks to secure affordable, low carbon energy supplies for homes and businesses and allow them to benefit from local renewable energy generation is broadly supported although the associated Action 'a', which requires on-site/local renewable/low carbon energy generation in new development should be re-worded to provide an element of flexibility to take account of sites where such provision may not be viable or feasible. The wording for Action 'a' should read; 'a Require where appropriate onsite/local renewable/low carbon energy generation in new development.	This aspiration should apply to all development. Issues relating to viability and feasibility are considered in the draft Development Management Policies document.	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	Yes - Esp. making energy efficiency standards higher than required levels.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15932	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				<p>Question 20 - Aspiration 2</p> <p>Water resources are a significant issue for Haverhill 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>	Agree that aspiration should be changed as suggested.	Add a new action (also added to Rural and Bury)
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	But such changes that are aspired to will require a good deal of financial investment and a significant change in people's attitudes and behaviour as well as the measures referred to in chapter 8.	The Council agrees that measures to improve sustainability will require a change in people's attitudes and behaviours.	Added a new paragraph which highlights the importance of change of behaviour
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no opinion	Still trying to work out what the actual question is!	Noted	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications 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 over-expansion of the Town. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extremely harmful effects of the expansion plans for the Borough. 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 many more inhabitants. Anglian Water's statement to the Council that there is sufficient capacity in its supply to accommodate growth to 2031 has a number of caveats concerning demand and supply development schemes.	Agree that the Vision needs to make specific reference to water supply and use.	Add new action

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough 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.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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.		
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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. 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.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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 flood risk management partners to ensure that this happens on all the proposed development sites in the borough, which is part the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy	The Council welcomes Suffolk County Council's support with regard to flood and water management	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Buzz words don't impress me.	Noted	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Too many people and traffic - building on green belt	There is no green belt within St Edmundsbury	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no	Insufficient information supplied in Vision 2031 document.	Noted	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 20: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you agree with our aspirations for sustainability and climate change?	Question 20b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Housing should only be increased at a lesser rate to jobs, otherwise the imbalance that exists between housing and jobs within Haverhill and surrounding area will be increased !	The proposed growth in employment provision is an essential part of the future development of Haverhill and will provide significant opportunities for employment growth. However, employment provision is not the only influence on housing demand and pressure for housing from outside the Borough cannot be ignored or dismissed.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Additionally licensing authorities should have more regard to the impact of permitting licensable activities and sales, dedicate more resources to monitoring and enforcement and be more willing to prioritise community safety over business demands. There should be planning policies requiring all new developments, residential and commercial, to be subject to a 'Safer by Design' review by Suffolk Constabulary. All new footway lighting units, bus shelters, amenity lights, road signs, should be illuminated by use of solar energy (footway lighting units are not street lights).	This is addressed by Policy 1 of the draft Development Management Policies Document.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	But we have heard similar aspirations since 1986 to no avail.	Levels of crime are already low, but this aspiration should ensure that we remain vigilant. However, this aspiration looks also at addressing the fear of crime, which can have a far greater impact than the incidence of crime itself.	Amend Aspiration 1 to refer to crime remaining low compared to national averages.
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				no	Yes 9.4g should be high priority.	Agree. However, this action would sit better under the following aspiration in broader terms.	Amend action and move to following aspiration

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	But we have heard similar aspirations since 1986 to no avail.	Levels of crime are already low, but this aspiration should ensure that we remain vigilant. However, this aspiration looks also at addressing the fear of crime, which can have a far greater impact than the incidence of crime itself.	Amend Aspiration 1 to refer to crime remaining low compared to national averages.
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications below in b). Yes, but by significantly increasing the population of the Borough, 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 another important reason why expansion plans for the town and the Borough as a whole, should be moderated.	There is no evidence that an increase in population will create an exponential increase in crime. The Police Authority advises on any increase in resource requirements arising from development proposals.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.</p>						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				<p>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 Haverhill, 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.</p>	Agree that issue of fire safety needs to be addressed.	Paragraph 9.6e added to include an action around fire safety.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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 back 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.	See above	See above
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	All new foot way lighting units, bus shelters, amenity lights, road signs, should be illuminated by solar and wind energy.	Noted. The Council can work with the providers including the highway authority to achieve this where possible.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes	But actions need to go further in providing regular, consistent places for youths to make their own and chill out with friends for very little cost. Ensures police know what's going on and where.	The Council agrees and considers that aspiration 1, action c, addresses this issue.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 21: Crime and Safety aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with our aspirations for crime and safety?	Question 21b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	These are standard requirements expected today and should not be part of a Vision statement.	The Council agrees that these aspirations are equally applicable to today's residents/businesses.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	The way stats are recorded has changed and crime in town is worse than ever. But thank you for the newly open drug counselling centre.	This comment falls outside the scope of this document	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Regarding improved safety, money needs to be spent on solutions in existing areas not just new developments.	The Council agrees that road safety is an important issue for existing developments.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Provision for a new cemetery is now urgent - the vision should contain a specific deadline for the procurement of a suitable site, and specific potential land allocations. 10.9(a) and (b) should be linked to a specific policy requiring developer contributions. There needs to be a specific planning policy regarding the installation of brown water recycling on all new residential developments. The existing household waste recycling plant in Coupals Road is inadequate for the current population. Provision needs to be made in the Vision for a new site, capable of handling the ncreased demand from a larger population.	The need for cemetery provision is identified in the document, but it cannot provide deadlines over which it has no control. If a site is identified, it may seek appropriate and proportionate developer contributions. Brown water recycling is carried out at the sewage treatment works. Grey water recycling is appropriate at the domestic level and is addressed by policies in the draft Development Management Policies document. The opportunity for improved household waste recycling needs to be explored with Suffolk County Council.	Amend paragraph 10.6 to make reference to the need to review the current household waste recycling facility.
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surr ridge				no	There are too many points in this section to make just one answer ref.10.5 Flood Risk mapping needs close scrutiny before the masterplan is made for NE Haverhill. Ref 10.9c I do not agree that the development area should be confined to NE Haverhill (see also comment in 1 Carisbrooke land south of the by-pass.) But I do agree with the remaining points in 10.9	Agreed that close scrutiny will be required of all flood risk mapping. The location of strategic growth areas within Haverhill has already been established in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen					COMMENT: More information needed	Comment is noted, but no information is given as to what sort of information is required in order to respond.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	10.4 Further work should be undertaken to verify the claim that the sewage treatment works is adequate for the proposed expansion, since its enlargement and relocation was deemed essential in the 1970 Masterplan. It was on the outskirts of the town when built and is now surrounded by housing and will virtually be in the middle when the expansion is complete. Just accepting Anglian Water's word should not be an option - they are profit making business and would not want to spend money.	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
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15932	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				<p>Question 22 - Aspiration 1</p> <p>Section 10.4 states that there is capacity at Haverhill's WwTW to include proposed growth within Haverhill. 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> <p>We are in agreement with section 10.9 points a, b, d, e, f and g.</p>	The advice relating to the WwTW was provided by Anglian Water Services, although it is acknowledged that the sewage network has limitations at paragraph 10.4. It will be necessary liaise with AWS in respect of proposals for development.	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	<p>But with reservations in respect of water runoff expressed elsewhere.</p> <p>whilst agreeing with the aspirations expressed in chapter 10 on infrastructure provision, we remain concerned about the method of delivery. Para. 10.3 refers to the water supply position but does not appear to take account shortages brought about by climate change and the current increase in demand for water. Para. 10.4 deals with the sewerage treatment facilities in Haverhill. Any increase in input to the plant will lead to an increase in output from it into the Stour Brook. The additional ambient flow in the Brook especially at times of flooding will undoubtedly cause concern to residents of sturmer.</p>	<p>All development will be required to utilise sustainable urban drainage (SUDS). Anglian Water advises that the proposed growth in Haverhill will not cause any problems in respect of water supply. 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.</p> <p>Any increased flows above consented flows from the Water treatment works will need approval from the Environment Agency.</p>	Add an action to support Anglian Water's programme of managing water and reducing leakage

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no	There are too many points in this section to make just one answer ref.10.5 Flood Risk mapping needs close scrutiny before the masterplan is made for NE Haverhill. Ref 10.9c I do not agree that the development area should be confined to NE Haverhill (see also comment in 1 Carisbrooke land south of the bypass.) But I do agree with the remaining points in 10.9	Agreed that close scrutiny will be required of all flood risk mapping. The location of strategic growth areas within Haverhill has already been established in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications 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 expansion of the town and the Borough as a whole. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extreme harmful of effects of building thousands of houses and substantially increasing the population. 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 51, Item 10.3] 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.	Agree that the Vision needs to make specific reference to water supply and use.	Add new action

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - 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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough 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 e 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 the problem by building thousands more houses in the Borough? 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.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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. We note the plan to update your Infrastructure Delivery Plan outlined in the Bury St Edmunds Vision document and also note that it is not replicated in the Haverhill document. 10.1 might be improved with a fuller description of the infrastructure that is and isn't included in this section. For example, v	Given that most funding for infrastructure will need to be obtained through the S106 or CIL process it is appropriate that aspiration 1 responds to growth. Details of the requirements will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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 Developers Guide, though it may not be helpful to refer specifically to the Developers Guide by name when the Vision documents are likely to have a longer lifespan than the Guide.	As has been identified, this chapter addresses those elements of infrastructure delivery which are not already addressed in other chapters.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	Specific planning policy for installation of brown water recycling on all new residential developments.	It is believed that this comment was intended to refer to grey water recycling. See comment in response to Haverhill Town Council above.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 22: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our aspirations for infrastructure and services?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21676E	Jason				no	It nice to have aspirations but I'm sure that you will deliver on the new house number part of the plans	Noted	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no	ref.10.5 Flood Risk mapping needs close scrutiny before the masterplan is made for NE Haverhill. Ref 10.9c I do not agree that the development area should be confined to NE Haverhill (see also comment in 1 Carisbrooke land south of the by-pass.)	Agreed that close scrutiny will be required of all flood risk mapping. The location of strategic growth areas within Haverhill has already been established in the adopted Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	To tackle the health inequalities that exist in Haverhill, it needs a proper network of cycle path/footpaths so that people can get out into the surrounding countryside and take exercise. Also - Health services need to be further improved and safeguarded, since the current Crown Healthcare facility (which would have been taken into account during this assessment) is already at threat from closure. This means there is a need for a permanent health centre, which should be located in the North/East housing area.	A health centre facility would be an appropriate facility within the NE Haverhill Strategic Growth Area.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 23: Allotments (HV15)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with Policy HV15?	Question 23b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	Agree in principle, but there should be provision in the Vision for additional allotment land over and above that to be provided by developers through Masterplans. This is based on existing, unmet, demand. The site at the junction of Duddery Hill and Hollands Road, already partly-used as private allotments, should be earmarked as future allotment land. There is a need for public open spaces adjacent to residences likely to accommodate families. Imaginative use of public art, surface feature mazes and effects and appropriate seating should be incorporated whilst avoiding 'off the grid' spaces where anti-social behaviour may occur. Overview of recreation/relaxation sites is preferred to discourage inappropriate use.	Noted. The need for allotments to be identified in masterplans sets out a requirement which will have to be addressed in those masterplans. However, it does not preclude the provision of further allotment provision by other means outside of the strategic planning process.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 23: Allotments (HV15)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with Policy HV15?	Question 23b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 23: Allotments (HV15)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with Policy HV15?	Question 23b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no	these play areas need to be away from day to day routines. ie shopping areas	Although the question relates to allotments, this section of the document also considers play opportunities. It specifically identifies that play does not need to be segregated from other activities.	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 23: Allotments (HV15)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with Policy HV15?	Question 23b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 24: Public Art

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 24: Public Art

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	Your objection to this suggestion is acknowledged	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21740E	Alison Plumridge	Smiths Row			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 24: Public Art**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Would you support the provision of public art installations in the town?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	There needs to be a policy that protects existing important open spaces, both grassed and hardpaved, from development. This will include redundant school sites, and playing fields, unless there is the dedication of equivalent, prepared, open space in a location that is more acceptable to the community. There needs to be a clear policy regarding size and nature of leisure facilities on new developments - LEAPS have, in the main been troublesome for local residents and not restricted to their intended uses, and the funding, and land may have been better spent in a different, central location. Engagement of young adults in planning and execution is an urgent requirement.	Policies within the draft Development Management Document provide protection for open spaces. These include both formal and informal recreation spaces and areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of an area. This document also includes policies relating to the provision of open space within new development.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Aspiration 1 should read "A wider range of top quality cultural and leisure opportunities will be offered, and will be increased as the town develops, to increase the time they spend in the town rather than travelling elsewhere" There should be an additional proposed action (f). Extend country parkland alongside the new housing of the north east Haverhill development, by extending East Town Park to Calford Green.	The issue of community parkland is addressed in paragraph 14.15 of this document. Links should be made in this section to the historic and natural environment section	Amend paragraph 11.2 to link it to comments in the historic and natural environment section and, in particular the issue of new community parkland.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	<p>Answer to question 24 We have enough and some are horrible blots on the landscape. There is no public art depicting Haverhill's heritage.</p> <p>Question 25 - Yes We need more green space in the town centre. As I have already mentioned - a park on the former Cleales site would be good - linked in with Chantry Mill retail units / residential apartments and cafes etc.</p>	Public art can be very subjective and one person's artistic gem may be another's blot. That is the nature of art. Public art depicting Haverhill's heritage does already exist in the entrance to Haverhill Arts Centre and the Queen Street gates were designed by local schools incorporating local themes. More local heritage artwork would be welcome. The provision of open space within the town centre can be addressed through the town centre masterplan.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	No opinion	(QUESTION 25 (b) - OBJECTION TO THIS QUESTION) Aspiration 1; Action D Action 'd' for Aspiration 1 states that new cultural and leisure facilities should be built in areas of population growth. Where this population growth results from major new development, any requirement for cultural and leisure facilities should be specifically related to that development. There should not be a requirement to address existing cultural and leisure facility deficiencies in Haverhill as part of the new strategic growth area at north-east Haverhill and it is considered that Action 'd' should be re-worded to make this distinction clear.	The requirement for facilities to be related directly to the development applies where there is a requirement for the development to directly fund those facilities. However, that does not preclude new development serving the whole town being sited within these areas.	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Comment for Qu 24 - A very good idea. Might also give the public to display collections? Qu 25 - Yes by making as much use of existing facilities and working with public services.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	Answer to Qu 25 - Yes Comment re Qu 24 - but this depends on location and nature of the art. I like the Spirit of Enterprise.	This support is welcomed. The nature of public art is very subjective and it is known that it will not appeal to all.	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				24. 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's 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. This should be reflected in this document.	Agree - the Council considers that the County Council is a key partner in the delivery of leisure and cultural services. Specific reference should be made to libraries and suggests that aspiration 1, action b and aspiration 3 b should be amended accordingly	Amend - 11.3 b and 11.16 b
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				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 towns like Haverhill. They are expected to share premises with other services, 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. Town libraries like Haverhill will act as hubs for outreach activity to surrounding neighbourhoods, including cultural and educational events and services.	The Council welcomes the use of library facilities as a community resource.	Amend - 11.3 b

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with our aspirations for culture and leisure?	Question 25b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	LEAPS are troublesome with local residents, funding from developments and engagement of young adults for what is needed should be inserted.	The Council agrees that engagement of communities, including young people, is important when developing cultural and leisure opportunities.	Amend - 11.5
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 26: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 26b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The vision should include a specific target for the number of places available in residential care and recognition that local residential care is the optimum provision to benefit the community from which vulnerable people are drawn. In addition the Vision should both protect existing health-care sites and identify locations for additional facilities. There must be a clear policy on providing life-time housing in all new residential development, so residents need not move as their ability to live unaided, or without assistance, changes.	This Vision document is intended to meet the demands of Haverhill over the next 20 years. Any target for the number of places available in residential care could only be based upon today's figures and would not provide the flexibility to adjust to changing requirements. Lifetime housing and meeting the needs of older and vulnerable people is addressed in Chapter 5 at Aspirations 1 and 3	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	Yes but 12.4F As the Suffolk Health Authority has now pulled the plug on this, how about changing this aspiration to a small hospital with the facilities of Newmarket? We have a bigger population than Newmarket now and no railway to our nearest large hospital, as does Newmarket.	Whereas a small hospital may be welcomed, the immediate demand is for a permanent drop-in centre to replace that recently closed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	Yes - Ensure health provision matches the growing population.	This is the intention of the actions.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 26: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 26b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	Yes but a drop in health centre will not be funded.	The Vision 2031 document covers the period up to 2031, during which time funding may be made available	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15884	Mr R Maidment			Haverhill Chamber of Commerce				No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 26: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 26b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				Aspiration 2 might be improved through including a reference to the contribution that access to countryside makes to health and wellbeing. Reference could be made to the increased use of pedestrian and cycle routes as an healthy travel option. Whilst we support the reference to higher air quality, this is not a particular issue in Haverhill as there are no declared Air Quality Management Areas.	The Council agrees with these comments. Suggest that paragraph 12.5 is amended so it is consistent with the next in Bury St Edmunds Vision (this includes reference to footpaths and cycling routes). Links need to be made to the Historic and Natural environment section, in particular the aspiration 3, green infrastructure	Amend paragraph 12.5 to make link to paragraph 14. 9.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 26: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 26b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no	Should have a community clinic for accidents, x-ray and plaster for broken limbs.	Whereas these facilities would be welcomed, the immediate demand is for a permanent drop-in centre to replace that recently closed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Add X-Ray facilities and minor injury unit.	Whereas these facilities would be welcomed, the immediate demand is for a permanent drop-in centre to replace that recently closed	
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	But try telling NHS Suffolk!	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	jagtar rai				yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				yes	Not sure Need extra Doctors surgeries open for longer hours and on week ends also dentist and health care across the board for diagnostic possibly cottage hospital	These facilities would be welcomed, but the immediate demand is for a permanent drop-in centre to replace that recently closed	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Health centre closing, greenbelt being taken, questions over elderly care, no nursery/school places or jobs current available Haverhill, crime increased, litter everywhere etc etc	These are issues that the Vision is seeking to address. However, some of listed issues are not supported by the available evidence. There is no green belt in Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 26: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with our aspirations for health and wellbeing?	Question 26b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Building houses so far away from the Town Centre is not going to encourage people to adopt a healthy lifestyle ! (They will already be travelling long distances in their cars to get to work, so are likely to use the same methods and places for leisure). Until Haverhill TC & St Edmundsbury BC realise that this is what people do and do something to improve on this, then little improvement likely. Need to make more attractive sustainable routes in and around the town and villages that people can access safely, for people to enjoy.	Agreed that sustainable routes are necessary and this is addressed in the travel section of the document.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 27: Safeguarding Education Establishments (HV16)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a Do you agree with Policy HV16?	Question 27b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The phrase in (i) 'enhancing the educational or community use' might be interpreted as largesse to sell part of the site for housing to sustain the school financially. It needs to be changed to removed from the policy.	Disagree. Such a scenario could not be justified by (i). This is why a special exception has been specifically identified in respect of Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes and no	Generally fully support policy HV16 as it recognises the need for the redevelopment and upgrading of the Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College campus. Request change to the policy to include appropriate cross reference to policy HV17 and recognition that enabling forms of residential development will be acceptable in those circumstances on the Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College campus.	Agreed	Amend Policy HV16 to cross reference HV17
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	Yes Educational attainment is now above national average.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes	This policy is generally supported as the accompanying text makes it explicit that it does not apply to redundant school sites which have been identified for alternative development elsewhere in the Vision Statement.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 27: Safeguarding Education Establishments (HV16)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a Do you agree with Policy HV16?	Question 27b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council has no strategic or service related 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
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 27: Safeguarding Education Establishments (HV16)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a Do you agree with Policy HV16?	Question 27b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	As in Cambridgeshire special school units should be added to all schools to "enhance the education of all the community".	Such development would accord with this policy.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	no nursery/school places available in local area, current schools are peppered with caravans. Middle schools lying vandalised what are the plans for now?	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Existing school sites are often are a good potential place for "Green infrastructure" that could be used as open green spaces. Why must they be developed for housing? They should be retained just in case future re-structuring of the Education system require such space.	The green infrastructure and open space contribution from schools is recognised. The policy proposes to safeguard school sites, not develop them for housing.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The vision should include a commitment to ensuring that any non-educational use development is not completed until educational use facilities have been completed. There is sufficient land on this site for new educational provision to be accommodated, even allowing for final; closure and demolition (including reversion to playing fields) of the old school blocks after moving to the new site. The previous policies protecting school playing fields should apply to this site as with all other school sites.	There needs to be a clear mechanism by which the development of any housing is linked to the delivery of new educational buildings. Given that the housing would be on the site of the existing buildings, it is unlikely that housing can be delivered ahead of the new school buildings. However, restrictions should not be placed on the site which could hinder delivery of the new school.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no	I note the policy regarding travel dependency, however an area within the site should be allocated for students arriving and departing by transport. At present the traffic situation in this regard is quite intolerable at Castle Manor entrance and surrounding roads.	This is a matter of detail which will need to be addressed in the masterplan which is required by the policy.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				no	I agree with the proposed move of Castle Manor School to the site of the old Parkway School as long as no large development takes place on the old site such as high rise buildings which would look over our property and cause much more traffic congestion in Beech Grove and Eastern Avenue.	The nature and scale of any development will need to be addressed in the masterplan which is required by the policy. The masterplan will be subject to public participation and consultation to address such concerns.	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15777	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology			no	This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown).	This matter will need to be addressed to inform the preparation of the masterplan	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15844	Roger Metcalf				no	No sooner than the leaflet is published indicating Landscape areas in Castle Reach/Castle playing fields then notices of plans to build on one of the fields appear building 100 houses. That particular land does have orchids on it a fact know to the Parks department when they leave from mowing in late Spring the area laterally the full width by 20 yards from the roundabout to Chimswell Wood.	Any development would be restricted within the existing school campus and would not extend onto existing public recreational open space. Further information will be developed through the development of a masterplan.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes and no	Fully support the policy recognition of need for expansion and redevelopment of the facilities of Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College. Fully support the need for enabling development in the form of residential development to come forward on part of the college site to help fund college redevelopment. Request change to the policy to recognise the viability issues involved in bringing forward this investment in new college facilities and how this strategy will be undermined if affordable housing as well as market housing has to be provided as part of any enabling residential development undertaken. If needed key worker accommodation for education related staff to be included within the college re-development. The precise location of new college buildings and associated facilities within the combined new Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College and Parkway Middle School sites should be determined by analysis of new school accommodation and associated facilities requirements and brought forward in a masterplan.	Agree that viability issues need to be addressed and will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications. However, it would be more appropriate for such consideration to be inserted in the supporting text, rather than written into the policy itself. This will allow consideration of all issues of viability which pertain at the time of an application.	Amend supporting text to make reference to issues of viability.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College				The masterplan for the site will identify the extent and location of enabling residential development. The proposals map reference associated with HV17 needs to clearly identify a single new site associated with the new enlarged Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College made up of the former Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College and Parkway Middle School sites. Preferable for the policy to clarify at this stage that access to new college site should be taken off Park Road.		
HVR15857	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd				
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPi	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). The extent of the development and a masterplan to be agreed with local residents.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). The sentence on the need for a travel plan ought to be strengthened to say that a travel plan shall be provided, rather than expected.	This archaeological evaluation will need to be addressed to inform the preparation of the masterplan. The need for a travel plan is addressed in Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Special school should be part of the expansion.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	If you want to expand education facilities, and I am sure the current headteacher would love to expand her empire, then build it. But don't use the excuse that residential development will be needed to "facilitate the delivery of educational facilities."	It has been brought to our attention that the existing school buildings are no longer fit for purpose. The recent change in the education system and the release of the Parkway Middle School site presents a rare opportunity to address the problems. The inclusion an element of residential development will reduce the requirement for public funding.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 28: Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College (HV17)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with Policy HV17?	Question 28b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no	I feel that the current Castle Manor building should remain as it is and be improved and/or extended as necessary. I feel this would be favourable over moving the School to a different location and replacing the existing site with residential properties. I think that the current Parkway Middle School site would be a more suitable area for residential development. This would cause less disruption to all parties. Unfortunately I cannot comment in extensive detail due to the vague information provided at this stage of consultation. But on a personal note I purchased the property on Beech Grove because of its location and the key feature that the garden backs onto the school which means we are not overlooked at every angle. The thought of having residential properties replacing the school is quite upsetting and would considerably change our privacy. On a separate note I would strongly hope that whatever the future plans may be for this site that the mature trees, which back onto the gardens of Beech Grove properties, would be left untouched.	It has been brought to our attention that the existing school buildings are no longer fit for purpose. The recent change in the education system and the release of the Parkway Middle School site presents a rare opportunity to address the problems. Development of the site will require the prior approval of a masterplan with input and consultation with all interested and affected parties including neighbouring residents. It will be possible to address the concerns relating to potential overlooking and the retention of beech trees through this process.	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Existing school sites are often are a good potential place for "Green infrastructure" that could be used as open green spaces. Why must they be developed for housing? They should be retained just in case future re-structuring of the Education system require such space.	It has been brought to our attention that the existing school buildings are no longer fit for purpose. The recent change in the education system and the release of the Parkway Middle School site presents a rare opportunity to address the problems. Green infrastructure will need to be addressed in the preparation of the masterplan.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15702	Mrs P. Guthrie				no	<p>1. Our garden backs onto this land and the drainage ditch runs from Duddery Hill and stops at our garden fence. Whenever there is a few days of wet weather our garden floods. The ditch and drainage from it is inadequate and our 40' garden is flooded.</p> <p>This would have to be dealt with. Ideally it should be resolved now but in 16 years no one will accept responsibility for this problem. We have been shunted between Wisdom's, Anglia Water, Rivers Authority and St Eds Env Health Dept - all of whom have inspected the ditch but I still don't know who is responsible. SO we carry on each year suffering the loss of plants, ruined garden and a very real fear of flooding in the home.</p>	This is an issue which will need to be resolved with any proposal for redevelopment through sustainable urban drainage. The draft Development Management Document contains the necessary policies to address this issue.	No changes required
	Mrs P. Guthrie					<p>2. Our garden has always been secluded and very, very quiet so any development would change that. We would be looking for assurances of a height restriction since a college would block out a lot of light, would easily overlook our garden and our privacy would be lost, not to mention hundreds of teenagers running amok making a terrific noise. SO we would insist on privacy, noise screening being maintained.</p>	Any form of development is likely to have an impact on surrounding properties and it will be necessary to ensure through the planning application process that residential amenities are not adversely affected.	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	As part of a previous Vision a site for a 6th form provision was previously identified off Ehringshausen Way. That site remains available and its proximity to the town centre will bring increased vitality to the town centre at lunch time. The need to allocate a new site has not been demonstrated. The policy should clarify that 'Further Education' includes lifelong learning.	The inclusion of this site for further education does not preclude consideration of alternative sites should they be suitable and become available. This would include the existing Upper schools. However, in the absence of an alternative site, this site, which is well located in relation to the town centre and the business community should be safeguarded.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15777	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.	Noted	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			no	Further Education development should be associated with the existing educational facilities in Haverhill to make best use of resources.	The inclusion of this site for further education does not preclude consideration of alternative sites should they be suitable and become available. This would include the existing Upper schools. However, in the absence of an alternative site, this site, which is well located in relation to the town centre and the business community should be safeguarded.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15871	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes	no	<p>The site ownership comprises the Silk Mill (i.e. the three storey red brick Victorian building fronting Colne Valley Road and the large complex of factory buildings on Duddery Hill), an area of private allotments (c.0.4ha), scrub land and Wisdom Business Centre on Hollands Road. The total area is approximately 4.6ha.</p> <p>At this stage, the Business Centre is omitted from consideration, therefore resulting in a 'redevelopment site' of 3.6ha.</p> <p>A manufacturing, distribution and ancillary office function continues at the Silk Mill, albeit in a reduced capacity, and Wisdom have no immediate plans to cease such operations. Notwithstanding this, given the time horizon of the Haverhill Vision, it is prudent to ensure that all development opportunities for the full site are given due consideration now.</p>	The proposed allocation comprises approximately 2ha of the total 4.6ha site within the ownership of Wisdom Toothbrushes and excludes the Silk Mill fronting Colne Valley Road and the large complex of factory buildings on Duddery Hill. The allocation would not impact adversely upon the continued operation of the manufacturing, distribution and office activity. Neither would it preclude development of that part of the site allocated for mixed use development in Policy HV6.	No changes required
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		<p>Like many manufacturing companies, Wisdom has a Pension Scheme, with business attached. Many of the pensioners and deferred pensioners are Haverhill residents and their future can be made more secure by the profitable development of these sites. It is therefore in the local interest that redevelopment here is optimized.</p> <p>A large area of the site inefficiently serves a limited number of allotments and scrub land. Approximately 2 expressions of interest in a plot are received each year.</p> <p>Given the size and close proximity to the town centre, this document seeks to provide redevelopment options that will provide much needed homes and/or employment for the town whilst maintaining the Victorian building and an area for allotments/public open space.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		<p>This diagram illustrates the relationship of the site to the High Street and other 'destination points' for patrons such as Tesco, Aldi, Haverhill Leisure Centre, and the Gurteens factory redevelopment. Bus and cycle links are also identified to encourage sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>Using the Wisdom site as another potential destination point would encourage potential customers ('footfall') to be pulled through the High Street from a destination point in the north en route to one in the south e.g. someone using the cinema would walk across the High Street to get to a retail/leisure use on the site thus offering new customer opportunities for shops in the town centre.</p> <p>This diagram refers to national planning policy requirements for potential town centre uses e.g. retail, leisure, offices.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		<p>A sequential approach is needed to confirm that no sites are available within the Primary Shopping Area before reviewing those next 'sequentially preferable' Edge of Centre. This is defined by a 300m distance from the PSA boundary (shown light pink). Permeability through the town centre is good, and whilst there is a gradual incline in topography from the High Street it is not considered likely to deter potential patrons (particularly as other destination points have similar topographical changes).</p> <p>Approximately 2ha of the site lies within this area and could therefore be considered for a town centre use.</p> <p>Other 'opportunity sites' identified in policy HV6 are also shown, outlined in white.</p> <p>This diagram shows the existing developed areas, the allotments, scrub land and a hard surfaced area adjacent to 42 Hollands Road currently used for manoeuvring of lorries and vans. Existing pedestrian and vehicular linkages are also shown. An area of 0.4ha is used for allotments. A typical 'plot' is 250m² and the area therefore has scope for approximately 16 plots, if used efficiently.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		<p>Historically, Wisdom has received very little interest from people enquiring about availability. Many people are in fact discouraged because of the path which cuts diagonally across (prompting theft/damage to produce) and the lack of on-site water provision (which was discontinued following on-going vandalism).</p> <p>It is understood that SEBC has approximately 50 people on its waiting list. A new allotment site is being created on a former school site in Haverhill, which will reduce the waiting list to about 20 people. It should be noted that not everyone will want a plot as large as 250m2 and therefore smaller plots should be considered.</p>		
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		<p>One 'redevelopment option' is for a new anchor retail unit of c.70,000ft, together with smaller retail/leisure and residential units formed around a circulation space. This would preserve the Victorian building and would provide car parking accessed from Hollands Road. A transport assessment would need to be carried out to assess and evaluate what traffic management measures would be needed to mitigate the additional volume of cars onto Duddery Hill/Hollands Road. An allotment /public open space of 0.6ha could be formed (equivalent of 24 large plots) in a relocated position to the south of the site, acting as a buffer between retail/residential and the General Employment Area of Hollands Road.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas		Wisdom Toothbrushes		A second 'redevelopment option' is a residential-led scheme, comprising medium density, two to three storey housing. As in option 1, an allotment/public open space of 0.6ha could be formed (equivalent of 24 large plots), together with the retention of the Victorian building. NB: The layout and composition of both schemes is for illustrative purposes only at this stage, as a means of identifying options to inform detailed public consultation at a future date.		
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	This facility should be for a technical college not a sixth form centre which I feel should be developed on existing school sites.	The policy relates to a sixth form/further education centre. It does not specify either, nor preclude either.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			yes	The extent of development and a masterplan to be agreed with local residents.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR16013	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				The site should be subject to a reptile surbey prior to any development being considered.	Noted. This will need to be considered before any application for development is determined.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council welcomes this suggestion of greater Further Education provision in Haverhill. In principle we support this allocation delivering a new facility, but the planning of any new institution should include other stakeholders, such as existing schools and the wider Young Haverhill Partnership, for example. Any institution needs to be visible, accessible, have the correct offer and be intrinsically linked to the current institutions serving the area. There are issues regarding funding the facility (the county council would not be able to fund it), but that issue would have to be resolved at the appropriate time. We have no objection in principle on historic environment grounds to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. The sentence on the need for a travel plan ought to be strengthened to say that a travel plan shall be provided, rather than expected.	It is acknowledged that further work will be required before any scheme for this facility can progress. Archaeological evaluation will need to be addressed to inform the preparation of the masterplan. The need for a travel plan is addressed in Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Should include lifelong learning.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Because the proposed site also currently covers an allotment. Try using Chalkstone Middle School complex instead - perfect space!	The inclusion of this site for further education does not preclude consideration of alternative sites should they be suitable and become available. This would include the existing Upper schools. However, in the absence of an alternative site, this site, which is well located in relation to the town centre and the business community should be safeguarded.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 29: Further Education Facility (HV18)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with Policy HV18?	Question 29b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Why on earth would 6th formers want to go all the way to Duddery Hill for education ? Such a centre would be better located near the existing Secondary Schools or the Town Centre ?	The inclusion of this site for further education does not preclude consideration of alternative sites should they be suitable and become available. This would include the existing Upper schools. However, in the absence of an alternative site, this site, which is well located in relation to the town centre and the business community should be safeguarded.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				no	Under education, both consultations would be more relevant if they explicitly supported more good school places, whether through new free schools academies, or any other policy. Support for local schools is important, but the proposed actions (17.8) trends around this issue, when we should strongly support new provision.	This representation relates to the Rural Vision 2031 document. The Haverhill Vision 2031 document has aspirations and actions which pay particular regard to the issues facing educational establishments in Haverhill.	No changes required
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	The policy should clarify that 'Further Education' includes lifelong learning.	agreed	Amend paragraph 13.16 to include a reference to lifelong learning
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15847	Shaun Hazlewood				no	Having just had my son refused entry into our catchment school (and packed off to a primary school 7 miles away), Clearly, the proposed increase in capacity in school places is insufficient for what will be a massive increase in the population of Haverhill. According to your representative, I believe you plan to build two primary schools but no secondary school. How are you going to cope with a school system already bursting at the seams?	The Council works with colleagues in Suffolk County Council to ensure that the number of schools places are adequate.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			no	Generally support subject to recommended changes to policies HV16, HV17 and HV18 as noted in this response.	Changes have been made to Policy HV16 as requested. Although the requested changes have not been made to Policy HV17, appropriate changes have been made to the supporting text.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15870	Ken Rolph				no	<p>Firstly I have been asked by my business neighbours, (most of whom use the local schools) to convey our utter astonishment that this site is to be used for educational or any other non industrial purpose when:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The allotments have always been part of the protected and ongoing commitment of Wisdom/Addis owners to the local Haverhill community. The owner would regularly boast to his workforce that he had put the land in covenant and that it was protected for this purpose. (I have a witness statement to this effect). 2. At least two of haverhill's former schools are empty, falling into dereliction, and easily suited to a sixth form college. 3. We are now at a point of shortage of medium to large basic industrial units. (For example Vitax have chosen to move out of town largely for this reason). If this site is not to be allotments, then it should be light industrial. 	<p>Covenants on land are a private matter which can be addressed by the individuals or parties affected. This does not affect the proposed allocation. Empty schools have been considered.</p> <p>The allocation does not propose a sixth form college. It is identified to meet the potential needs of further education for the town which may include sixth form facilities, but also adult education and vocational training. This could require a link up with local businesses in both the retail and industrial; sector. The site is well located to serve both these sectors. There remains adequate available land for further industrial and commercial expansion within the town for the plan period.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ken Rolph					<p>Secondly, if this is a done deal, and it certainly looks like the full story is not in the public arena, then:</p> <p>1. The old railway line should be protected, opened up as a cycle/walkway, and extended from the back of the Wisdom Centre, then routed along the Eastern/North Eastern edge of the site, to cross Duddery Hill and link to a route to town centre, the recreation ground and beyond. In the long run this should form a route parallel to the chalkstone railway path, linking up at both ends, fully in compliance with your Haverhill Vision, section7, Aspiration 1.</p> <p>Since the property speculators you are dealing with own part of this route, and since this stretch is critical to any southern walking cycling link, the issue must be addressed at this stage.</p>	<p>This is not a 'done deal'. Its inclusion in this document is consistent with the other aspirations and policies within the document in seeking opinion. The opportunity offered by the route of the railway should be fully explored and would be consistent with the aims of aspiration 1 in Section 7 of this document.</p>	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ken Rolph					<p>2. Lorry and HGV access to the Wisdom Centre can only be obtained through the old car park (ex IMI/RA Industrial), which now seems to have been incorporated into the HV18 site. The other entrance is not suitable for large vehicles and at least two of the current tenants would directly suffer from any loss of access. Indeed one tenant has tried to negotiate a long term lease and has been point blank refused (it seems because of property speculation?). Any further loss of industrial premises would be totally unacceptable, yet HV18 would seem to point towards a different usage for the Wisdom centre.</p> <p>3. Currently there is a problem (last three years) with teenagers gathering at night on the Herbert Retail Partnership car park in Rookwood Way.</p>	The existing Wisdom buildings are currently located within the Housing Settlement Boundary for Haverhill and the allotments are within an area of White land, outside of the General Employment Area. Any development proposals will need to take account of any existing access requirements to adjacent premises. Development of this site would not require the loss of any existing industrial premises. It is not reasonable to link the establishment of a further education facility with increased crime.	No changes required
	Ken Rolph					We feel that if this linked to teenagers coming from a site on HV18, then we would have a major security problem. We sell power tools and hand tools, have no budget for a security guard, and would have a major headache trying to police a shop and frontage that would extend along both Rookwood Way (including our Rear delivery areas) and Hollands Road (Our engineers shop front). We would need financial assistance to bring our security up to the level of a Retail supplier.		
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	(a) no opinion (b) no	<p>Aspiration 3; Action A</p> <p>Under Aspiration 3 of the education and skills Chapter, education facilities are proposed to be of a high standard and fulfil a wider community role. Action 'a' associated with this Aspiration indicates that two new primary schools will be sited to the north of Haverhill. It is assumed that the text should read to the north-east of Haverhill, in association with the new strategic neighbourhood.</p> <p>If this is the case, at this early stage in the planning process and given the changes that have been made to the education system in Haverhill over recent months moving from three tier to two tier provision, it is considered that more detailed work and assessment is needed into the primary school education requirements resulting from the new development at north-east Haverhill before final conclusions can be drawn in respect of the number of primary schools that may be required as part of the development.</p>	Paragraph 13.12 action a should refer to north-east Haverhill. Based upon current thresholds, the scale of development will require two primary schools.	Amend Action a under paragraph 13.12 to read 'north-east Haverhill'.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a		To this effect, the landowner's preferred option draft concept plan does identify land for two primary schools but one is a provisional site, subject to need. The wording of Action 'a' should therefore be altered to reflect this as follows; 'a Allocate land for one primary school, with the potential for a second primary school subject to need, to the north (or north-east) of Haverhill.'		No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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 13.15b) 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. 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.	Agree - The Council agrees that the raising of the participation age needs to be addressed.	Amend paragraph 13.14 and action (b), paragraph 13.15 accordingly.
						Lastly, we feel that the text could do more in terms of reflecting the emergence of Free Schools and Academies. (See Appendix to letter attachment on education provision).	Agree - paragraph 13.4 needs to reference the changing school provision.	Amend paragraph 13.4
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 30: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a Do you agree with our aspirations for educations and skills?	Question 30b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Should include lifelong learning.	Agree, lifelong learning links with our aspiration to enhance adult skills levels and should be made more explicit in the document.	Amend paragraph 13.16 to include a reference to lifelong learning
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes	Generally yes. Especially getting kids out of cars and onto their feet.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergeant				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	Efficient use of Vacant School Sites should be for leisure and recreation.	These are uses which may be appropriate, but should not be the only option.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	As awareness of endangered wildlife and the threats to habitats increases there should be additional areas protected. Connections between associated areas need protection and the immediate environs of heritage locations should also be considered. The loss of hedgerows and the continuing threats to bat roosts are examples of where policy has previously failed.	These matters are addressed by the adopted Green Infrastructure Strategy.	No changes required
HVR15723	Margaret Chapman				no	The area between Calford Green and Haverhill and surrounding Calford Green - development would destroy a unique hamlet, devalue existing period properties.	This area is already recognised and afforded protection in Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	yes - with the exception of 14.5 which is full of ambiguity. Parkland is trees and grass. Public amenity space could mean skateboard parks, go cart tracks or toddler paddling pools...or anything in-between, perhaps literally. There needs to be a transparency over what is intended. Otherwise leave grade 2 agricultural land as it is now. This statement appears to be at variance with stakeholder bullet 9 on page 79	These comments are addressed in response to Q32. This question relates specifically to identifying areas of special character.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Protection should be provided in the triangle between Calford Green, the Wilsey Estate and Coupals Road to enable East Town Park to be extended. This will be the last possible opportunity to provide the size of country park for Haverhill, commensurate with its increased urban size. This area will also protect the much valued Haverhill Country walks from urbanisation, and maintain the wildlife corridor. To this same end the tree belt integrity in this area should be preserved. See appendix 1 National Planning Framework Request.	The protection being suggested is acknowledged and could be achieved through the development of the masterplan for this area. It is not considered appropriate for designation as an area of special character.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				yes	Calford Green due to listed houses, wildlife, and loss of area character if changed. Woodland Green as historically owned by Sturmer. Also so few original 'Greens' still exist in the Haverhill area. Cross hatching in green of land between Great wilsey and Roost End- landscape enhancements? How should you improve a naturally beautiful landscape? Shouldnt we know more as you have cross hatched over our land? It states small settlements will be conserved, there is not enough land between the development and Calford green to conserve it as a separate settlement. Amenity land butting to it will not conserve its character.	Calford Green is already afforded protection through Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. Woodland Green, Sturmer is outside the Borough and located within Braintree District. The landscape enhancements and cross hatching referred to are features contained within the adopted green Infrastructure Strategy which was the subject of public consultation prior to adoption.	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	Chantry Road, Broad Street, Chainey Pieces, Vine Cottages, Weavers Cottages (Camps Road) - These are all part of the town's Victorian heritage - I would definitely not agree to the demolition of the Victorian buildings on the Gurteens site either.	Chantry Road, Broad Street, Chainey Pieces and Gurteen's Mill are located within a Conservation Area, so are already afforded protection. Furthermore the buildings at Gurteen's Mill are listed Grade 2. Individual buildings or groups of buildings may be worthy of consideration as Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Significance. Weavers Cottages are already identified as such.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes	I feel that Chantry Mill and the old Addis buildings should be preserved because we are in danger of losing all our buildings of heritage and interest, even if they are industrial buildings. They should be restored and developed sensitively so that local people are proud of our heritage - weaving.	Chantry Mill is already afforded protection, being within a Conservation Area and listed Grade 2. The Victorian Addis (Wisdom) building in Colne Valley Road is of importance to the locality and is worthy of consideration as a Building of Local Architectural or Historic Significance.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A court order stopped development of old orchard site bordering Deans and Chaplains Close. This area should be protected. 2. The Wisdom Factory, an old silk factory, should be preserved. It can be redeveloped as housing, as planned for the Atterton & Ellis site. 3. Chantry Road / Chainey Pieces. 4. What can be done to stop the Corn Exchange from deteriorating further. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 This area is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. 2 The Victorian Wisdom building in Colne Valley Road is of importance to the locality and is worthy of consideration as a Building of Local Architectural or Historic Significance. 3 Chantry Road/Chainey Pieces are located within a Conservation Area and are already afforded protection. 4 The Corn Exchange is a Listed Building. The owner has a statutory duty to maintain the building. Appropriate action is available should the building deteriorate. 	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	With the exception of 14.5 which is full of ambiguity. Parkland is trees and grass. Public amenity space could mean skateboard parks, go cart tracks or toddler paddling pools –or anything inbetween, perhaps literally. There needs to be a transparency over what is intended. Otherwise leave grade 2 agricultural land as it is now. This statement appears to be at variance with stakeholder bullet 9 on page 79	These comments are addressed in response to Q32. This question relates specifically to identifying areas of special character.	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Our Petition Relates Specifically to this Question. Our petition and this response links to the submission we have made under the Bury and Rural Areas 2031 Vision. Our application asked for our particular area to be designated as a Residential Area of Special Character but also asked for the such areas to be considered across the Borough. 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.	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. Low density development is not synonymous with reducing demand on transport and public services. It requires a greater land take and the additional distances created encourage further reliance upon the car.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				<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</p> <p>Whilst they are not generally of sufficient historical or architectural value to warrant conservation status, they contain the following attributes:</p> <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>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<p>They contain large, well landscaped gardens with extensive space around and between dwellings. 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. 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.</p> <p>[Taken from a report released by Environmental Protection UK, June 2010]</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<p>There is a high demand in the local housing market for such properties.</p> <p>Protection Required for Areas of Special Character</p> <p>Having said, in the Vision document, that there are Areas of Special Character in the town 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 Vision but consider that other LDF documents will provide this. 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 are not site or location specific. 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>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<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 Framework].</p> <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>		
	Michael Schultz					<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.</p> <p>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> <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.</p> <p>New development to take account of existing front and rear building lines.</p> <p>Existing mature trees and landscaping to be maintained.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					Conversions of houses to flats or for commercial use will not be acceptable. Creation of access roads through plots in order to develop land within, beyond or adjacent to the area will not be acceptable. Alterations, extensions, annexes etc to be allowed provided they follow policy 24 of the Draft DPD.		
	Michael Schultz					Many Councils have designated [Residential] Areas of Special Character and introduced polices for protection similar to the foregoing. They play a major role in maintaining the attractiveness of the Town. Without them, the Borough would be poorer and consist principally of high density housing with small gardens and no residential or landscape character. Our petition calls for Residential Areas of Special Character to be designated across the whole Borough. A number of settings have been named in Bury St. Edmunds and in the Rural Areas. Local residents in Haverhill are best placed to decide which areas would qualify for designation.		
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council has no comments to make on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes	site ref HV7b this should form part of the conservation area leading to the newt pond to preserve the wildlife.	HV7b is currently a recreational open space. It is not considered appropriate as an Area of Special Character, but may have merit as an open space.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Nothing in Haverhill, including the existing conservation areas (who ever chose Queens Street), is worth preserving other than Anne of Cleves House.	The existing Conservation Areas are supported by a detailed appraisal of their character and importance. These are available for inspection.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott					IT HAS BEEN FOUND THAT THE LOCAL AREAS STOKE BY CLARE CLARE ,BOYTON END, KEDINGTON AND HAVERHILL OUT SKIRTS WHERE YOU INTEND TO BUILD AS HABITAT FOR SNAKES ADDERS AND BLACK ADDERS WHICH ARE QUITE RARE, HAVE BEEN FOUND LOCAL HOW? WILL YOU SURVEY THIS AND WHAT ASSURANCES WILL YOU GIVE THAT YOU WILL NOT BE DESTROYING THE POPULATION IN SUFFOLK ?	All areas proposed for development will be subject to survey for protected species and appropriate mitigation taken.	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				yes	Refer to Question 6. COMPLETE PRESERVATION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	Such a broad designation could not be sustained.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Sorry but to late! Was this information requested 20 years ago before houses were built everywhere?	Thank you for responding. The opportunity to designate areas of unique and special character did not exist 20 years ago.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 31: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you feel we need a special policy and designation in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 31b - Are there any parts of Haverhill (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	yes with the exception of 14.5 which is full of ambiguity. Parkland is trees and grass. Public amenity space could mean skateboard parks, go cart tracks or toddler paddling pools and other similar non environmentally friendly facilities. There needs to be a transparency over what is intended. Otherwise leave grade 2 agricultural land as it is now. This statement appears to be at variance with stakeholder bullet 9 on page 79. If public amenity space is planned then planting will need to begin well in advance.	These comments are addressed in response to Q32. This question relates specifically to identifying areas of special character.	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes	The urban edge of Haverhill has a strong, clearly defined boundary, tied to firm ground features. It is on high quality farm land which is well planted with suitable greenery which protects the neighbouring settlements from urban creep.	This strong urban edge is acknowledged and can be carried forward with the new strategic areas of growth.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	There should be a commitment to identifying more recent historic areas. Hamlet Road, for example, has terraces of housing and the Old Independent Church which may need protection through limiting adjacent development.	The area referred to is already within a designated Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to consider the impact of development adjacent to the Conservation Area upon the Conservation Area.	No changes required
HVR15723	Margaret Chapman				no	By developing land surrounding Calford Green you would be destroying a natural environment	This is dependent upon the nature of the development. For example, the creation of parkland from arable land could enhance the natural environment.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	Yes with the proviso of 14.5 as in 31	Chapter 14 relates to historic and natural environment rather than general leisure provision. Paragraph 14.5 therefore is intended to relate to elements of the natural environment	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Aspiration 1 is too limited in its action 14.6 should state that it WILL EXTEND EAST TOWN PARK TO CALFORD GREEN, not just 'explore it's extension'. Aspiration 3 Green Infrastructure is again too limited regarding green corridors and Haverhill community parkland. It needs to specify a substantial country park rather than a small pocket of community land. It is small town thinking when Haverhill is becoming a large town, and needs large town attractions for its residents. The aspiration should encompass green corridors linking and leading to the parkland in the triangle between Calford Green, the Coupals Road, and the Wilsey estate, which is an extension of East Town Park. The existing woodland belt should be maintained in its complete integrity alongside this area.	This is an unrealistic proposal at present. Even if the land incorporated within the Strategic growth Area fronting Coupals Road was included as parkland, it is separated from the existing East Town Park by land in different use and control and falling within the administrative boundary of a different District and County. The green corridors are identified in the existing adopted Green Infrastructure Strategy. There will be opportunities to review this when the Strategy is reviewed.	No changes required
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15857	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Mr Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd				No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	14.7 The last sentence is defeatist rubbish. Mildenhall? 14.8c should include an aspiration for a museum. The Local History group centre attracts a great many visitors, is staffed entirely by volunteers and has far too much to display in that small room - what is this if it is not an effort to meke people proud of their town and heritage. The Borough Council is far too ready to write Haverhill off as a place with no history!!!	Acknowledge sentiment with respect to paragraph 14.7. Do not understand the reference to Mildenhall. Action c could include museum provision, but is not prescriptive	Delete final sentence in paragraph 14.7
HVR15867	Mr K Fowler				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		Noted	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	A heritage centre with permanent displays, staffed by volunteers, would help preserve a sense of place. Perhaps this could be located in the northern lights sewing room of Chantry Mill, with a cafe as a draw opening out into the Churchyard.	The suggested heritage centre would accord with this aspiration, but its provision would be dependant upon support from the relvant landowner.	No changes made
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15895	Janet Nuttall	Natural England				<p>(Support). St Edmundsbury Borough Council Local Development Framework - Publication of Preferred Options Haverhill Vision 2031</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 29th February 2012 consulting Natural England on the above LDF Preferred Options Publications. Our comments on this are as follows:</p> <p>As you know, Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We are generally very supportive of this document and particularly welcome proposals to protect and enhance the natural and built environment and to increase the provision of green open space and access to the countryside. We note and welcome recognition of the importance of addressing the challenges of climate change and the need to mitigate and adapt to this through, for example, renewable energy and water efficiency measures.</p>	This support is welcomed	Replace all references to the draft NPPF with adopted NPPF.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	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. 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 amended slightly to identify that '...all new development will seek to protect and enhance Breckland Special Protection Area....' in line with statutory and national policy requirements and particularly the newly adopted NPPF.</p>		
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England				<p>Natural England generally 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>		

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England				<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. 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.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	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; it does, however, identify potential negative impacts on locally important habitats and species. 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>	This comment relates to a different document.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall	Natural England				Habitats Regulations Assessment 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. We note that detailed assessment, including in-combination effects, was undertaken at the Core Strategy stage and since the Haverhill Vision 2031 does not promote any additional development, no further assessment is necessary. We are satisfied with the conclusion of the HRA that the Haverhill Vision 2031 is unlikely to have a significant effect on European sites. You should refer to our response to the Core Strategy for further comments on specific policies and sites. I hope you will find these comments helpful.	This comment relates to a different document.	No changes required
HVR15896	Emma Goodings	Braintree District Council			yes	Braintree Council is supportive of the aspiration to improve East Town Park for the benefit of all residents living in the area. However any increase in the size of the town park could impact on land in Braintree District and the District and Parish Councils would wish to be fully involved in any plans at the earliest stage. The Council would not wish for any actions or plans for the park to increase the number of people accessing the site by private vehicle.	Noted	No changes required
HVR15897	Peter Donoghue							
HVR15903	Mrs P Henderson Gray	St. Felix RC Primary						
HVR15905	Tony Orgee	Abingtons Ward						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15932	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				Question 32 - Aspiration 3 Green Infrastructure can provide numerous multi-functional benefits including sustainable drainage, pedestrian transport areas and biodiversity improvements (such as wildlife corridors). Therefore, we support Aspiration 3 for the protection and enhancements of green infrastructure.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	With the proviso of 14.5 as in 31	Chapter 14 relates to historic and natural environment rather than general leisure provision. Paragraph 14.5 therefore is intended to relate to elements of the natural environment	No changes required
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
HVR16013	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				Paragraphs 14.9-14.12: 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.	The document is supported by a separate infrastructure delivery plan.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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). 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. 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. 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.	Detailed development management policies are included within the draft Development management Policies document currently being progressed jointly with Forest Heath District Council. These should be read in addition to the Vision 2031 document. It is agreed that promotion is insufficient.	Amend second aspiration.

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				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). We feel that protection of public open space is very important, for, amongst other reasons, the impacts on quality of environment and health.	The aspirations need to be reviewed accordingly	Review aspirations and actions

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				For that reason we support the aspiration to protect and enhance the green infrastructure of Haverhill (aspiration 3) and support vigorous protection of open space through DM Policy 40. 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 landuse, 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. Aspiration 2 could perhaps be improved with an action to improve countryside access, walking and cycling routes as a way of delivering action C. We feel that this document could be improved with a more explicit link between the annotated map in Figure 7.3 and policies; the borough council's strategy for improving green infrastructure could be clearer.	Agreed regarding comments about access to the countryside	Added a new paragraph 14.8e
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				Finally, the borough council may be aware of proposals to extend the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst there are no firm proposals at the current time, this document perhaps ought to consider the potential for extending the AONB into St Edmundsbury.		
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20999E	Chad				no	meldham washlands i would like this area to be mixed use. Be enhanced for both wild life and family's for a park for this side of town.(gateway) from cambridge As driving past you would not even know its there. it don't feel part of the town, just waste land .better access /signs /paths / bird huts / planting of trees shrubs flowers / level lawn picnic area with park tables benches bins. this would encourage use and make it feel part of Haverhill and still leave a large area for the natural habitat.	The Meldham Washlands are first and foremost a flood alleviation scheme for the town, but these suggestions accord with the aspirations	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	If you plan to build on any greenfield sites then you do not aspire to protect the natural environment	There is no conflict between sensitive development and protection and enhancement of the natural environment. This is illustrated by the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031

Question 32: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with our aspirations for historic and natural environment?	Question 32b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	<p>Supposedly, the aspiration is for the green infrastructure of Haverhill to be protected and enhanced ???</p> <p>This will not happen if the green infrastructure is taken away (schools land). Also green infrastructure is the current buffer zone. If this is taken away, then an equally strong new urban edge should be re-instated.</p>	There is no conflict between sensitive development and protection and enhancement of the natural environment. This is illustrated by the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The document clearly identifies the protection of the playing fields within school sites, allowing development only on the existing developed areas. It is not proposed to remove existing buffer zones, but where new development extends beyond these buffers, new buffers will be required.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				no	The section on the High Street could be much stronger. The High Street needs serious attention. I am concerned that simply allocating the car parks for brownfield development could be counter productive, without tackling some of the bigger issues like the quality of the existing buildings, and access to them.	The scale of the challenge is acknowledged by the need to prepare a masterplan outside of the preparation of this document.	Explore options through masterplan process.
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	In 2012 the Town Centre has limited capacity for substantial development. The vision should include 'joining up' the linear High Street with the Leisure hub on Ehringshausen Way and anticipate high volume outlets similar to the supermarket ribbon adjacent. With the bus station central to this area the opportunity to expand retail capacity should connect Town Centre shopping with Market and volume shopping.	This is likely to be a feasible option, which can be explored further through the preparation of a masterplan. The Vision 2031 document should not pre-judge an appropriate solution, which may limit other viable alternatives not yet considered.	Explore options through masterplan process.
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no	Until rear access to the shops is achieved I do not see a way forward.	Achieving rear service access is a key element. However, alternative service provision has been successfully achieved in other towns.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				yes	Yes except that 15.3 (b) needs to be revisited in the light of the council commissioned shopper survey which overwhelmingly voted against pedestrianisation of the town centre. (personally, I have no view either way about this issue)	Although the recent survey does not support full pedestrianisation, the Vision Document looks forward to 2031, during which period the situation may be re-assessed. Options may be considered in the preparation of the town centre masterplan.	Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes	Yes, who wouldn't? 15.3A - And how do you propose to do that without negotiating with the landlords on reasonable rents? 15.3b That isn't going to happen now is it?	15.3a - This is an issue which affects town centres across the country and needs addressing nationally. A start can be made by identifying and compiling a register of landlords. 15.3b - Although the recent survey does not support full pedestrianisation, the Vision Document looks forward to 2031, during which period the situation may be re-assessed. Options may be considered in the preparation of the town centre masterplan.	Explore options through masterplan process. Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street
HVR15867	Mr K Fowler				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes	YES although I do not want to see new modern architecturally boring buildings. Please see my suggestion about Chantry Mill and Addis factory.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	Yes - see my reply to question 8 Generally believe in suggestions with the exception of Atterton and Ellis and Chantry Mill. Think the buildings should be restored - used as small business centre / special shops /exhibitions.	Atterton and Ellis lies outside of the town centre and has planning permission for redevelopment retaining historic buildings and recreating the form of others. The intention with Chantry Mill is to retain the historic buildings and convert them to new uses, including those suggested.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no	Total pedestrianisation of High Street is not possible because some businesses do not have rear access and Haverhill is not a large enough town to dictate delivery hours to suppliers (Cambridge can). Also due to gradients to car parks, access for disabled must be allowed. Haverhill Locality Planning Network has suggested a manned barrier to allow permitted traffic in.	For the moment, full pedestrianisation may not be required, but this Vision is looking 20 years into the future. It is, therefore incorrect to state that pedestrianisation is not possible. There are challenges and difficulties, but there will also be opportunities.	Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	Except that 15.3 (b) needs to be revisited in the light of the council commissioned shopper survey which overwhelmingly voted against pedestrianisation of the town centre. (personally, I have no view either way about this issue)	Although the recent survey does not support full pedestrianisation, the Vision Document looks forward to 2031, during which period the situation may be re-assessed. Options may be considered in the preparation of the town centre masterplan.	Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no opinion	For the people of Haverhill to decide.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council supports the aspiration for the town centre, though we would suggest that the value of the market ought to be recognised somewhere in the aspiration or the proposed actions. We note that Aspiration 1, 15.3b refers to pedestrianisation of the High St. This has recently been consulted on and due to the level of objection not taken forward, so the borough council might consider removing it from this document. However, there is currently a scheme to improve the High Street environment funded by SEBC and the LTP.	Although the recent survey does not support full pedestrianisation, the Vision Document looks forward to 2031, during which period the situation may be re-assessed. Options may be considered in the preparation of the town centre masterplan.	Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	To include encourage developers to build bigger shops to include "joining up" the High Street with the Leisure hub on Ehringshausen Way.	Agree - needs to be explored through masterplan.	Explore options through masterplan process.
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no	I do not agree to pedestrianising the town centre all of the time. Perhaps in 10 years time this can be looked at again when there are more people living here but convenient access to the shops means I can still use the town shops instead of the superstores after work during the week.	Although the recent survey does not support full pedestrianisation, the Vision Document looks forward to 2031, during which period the situation may be re-assessed. Options may be considered in the preparation of the town centre masterplan.	Change action 15.3 b to Enhance the High Street
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	Forget it. Let it become a small parade of independent, but useful, shops and let the big boys occupy sites on the edge of town.	This suggestion runs counter to national planning policy and does not assist those who do not have access to a car.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 33: Town Centre aspirations

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with our aspirations for the town centre?	Question 33b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				yes	NO MORE CHARITY OR BETTING SHOPS BRING IN SOME CHARACTER	The Borough Council has no discretion over who occupies a shop.	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Well not much has changed following 20 years of housing developments and I'm sure we will have more houses and little change in shopping facilities in the future. We travel to Bury, Cambridge or Sudbury if we need something. Tescos has killed the high street. PS. thanks for the betting shops, charity shops and pawn brokers holding the town together	Without improving the offer in Haverhill, people will continue to travel elsewhere. Evidence from retailers in the town centre does not support the assertion that Tesco has killed the high street.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 34: Town Centre Masterplan (HV19)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with Policy HV19?	Question 34b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no	As a resident of Quaker's Lane and on behalf of my neighbours, I do not object in principle to mixed use redevelopment of Cleaves/Town Hall Car Park. However I am concerned that no development which would overlook my garden is allowed. I would ask that this understanding is acknowledged in the town centre masterplan which will be prepared.	This is an issue which will need to be addressed in a masterplan and any subsequent planning application.	No changes required
HVR15722	Will Austin	Haverhill Town Council			no	This Policy, as set out, prevents any town centre development until the Masterplan has been consulted upon, agreed and adopted. Given the limitations on the retail sector, the existing High Street and Queen Street, it is important that a policy exists to enable applications ahead of the Masterplan, for which no timescale for preparation, consultation and adoption has been given. If the recession ends the town needs to be in a position to take advantage quickly. Land to the South of the High Street needs to be set aside to develop East / West traffic routes. The Masterplan should focus on land to the North.	The purpose of the masterplan process is to assist development in the town centre, not to act as a barrier. The second paragraph of the policy is not intended to restrict development, but relates specifically to development of a strategic nature.	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				no		Achieving rear service access is a key element. However, alternative service provision has been successfully achieved in other towns.	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				Yes	Yes except that 15.3 (b) needs to be revisited in the light of the council commissioned shopper survey which overwhelmingly voted against pedestrianisation of the town centre. (personally, I have no view either way about this issue)	This issue has been addressed in response to question 33	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 34: Town Centre Masterplan (HV19)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with Policy HV19?	Question 34b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				no	We do not need all the big retailers in the town when we have Cambridge and Bury within 20 miles. We should encourage small individual business - offer incentives.	This is not a view shared by many residents of Haverhill, who do not wish to have to travel to Cambridge or Bury. Without larger retailers people will continue to shop elsewhere and ignore Haverhill. It is not intended to replace local businesses, but to provide for both national and local retailers.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			yes	With the proviso of 15.5(b) as in 33.	There is no (b) in 15.5. However, 15.3 (b) which relates to pedestrianisation will need to be addressed.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 34: Town Centre Masterplan (HV19)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with Policy HV19?	Question 34b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021). This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.			no opinion	For the people of Haverhill to decide.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council welcomes efforts to regenerate Haverhill, especially in a coordinated manner. We are concerned, however, by the second paragraph in this policy, which is potentially restrictive if major retailers wish to locate in Haverhill ahead of the production of a masterplan. The first paragraph of the policy is surely sufficient to prevent development coming forward prematurely, whilst allowing the flexibility to seize opportunities?	The purpose of the masterplan process is to assist development in the town centre, not to act as a barrier. The second paragraph of the policy is not intended to restrict development, but relates specifically to development of a strategic nature.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 34: Town Centre Masterplan (HV19)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with Policy HV19?	Question 34b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				yes	Some relaxation for a developer to start developing the town centre.	More information is required as to what sort of relaxation is required.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	<p>I never did agree with the MasterPlan as was drawn up by Councillors and businesses without any consultation with the residents.</p> <p>And the development of the cinema complex was never in those plans but was mysteriously added by taxpayers paying for it. Whatever happened to all the fountains and other such leisure areas planned for that area?</p> <p>The Queen Street repaving has been a fiasco and SEBC were told that at the time but of course they know best. The lack of permanent pedestrianisation has caused the paving to go oily and greasy due to the number of cars and takeaway establishments in the road. The ability to park where you like makes it now "Queen Street CarPark" - a free facility in the centre of town.</p>	The masterplan was produced in consultation with all interested parties including residents. It is acknowledged that the cinema did not form part of those plans, but it was identified through separate consultation as a high priority by residents. The information relating to funding from taxpayers is incorrect. The Queen Street repaving was achieved with minimal disruption to traders and has significantly improved the appearance of the area. The oil stains from traffic and flouting of parking regulations are acknowledged, but are being addressed.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott					FREE PARKING ,STOP HEAVY TRAFFIC TAKING SHORT CUT THROUGH CHALKSTONE ESTATE	Parking may be addressed through the masterplan, as may any identified link between the town centre and traffic problems elsewhere.	No changes required
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 34: Town Centre Masterplan (HV19)

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with Policy HV19?	Question 34b - If not, what changes would you like to be made, and why?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no opinion	Well not much has changed following 20 years of housing developments and I'm sure we will have more houses and little change in shopping facilities in the future. We travel to Bury, Cambridge or Sudbury if we need something. Tesco's has killed the high street. PS. thanks for the betting shops, charity shops and pawn brokers holding the town together	Without improving the offer in Haverhill, people will continue to travel elsewhere. Evidence from retailers in the town centre does not support the assertion that Tesco has killed the high street.	No changes required
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				yes	with the proviso of 15.5(b) as in 33	There is no (b) in 15.5. However, 15.3 (b) which relates to pedestrianisation is addressed in response to question 33	No changes required
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15686	Mrs H E Gare				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15707	Dennis Conway Backler				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15724	Basil Rowley				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15725	John Benton				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15728	Brigitte Heard				no	<p>I write with my comments objecting to the proposals for North East Haverhill as follows:</p> <p>1.As a resident on the Great Wilsey development I would say that our area has already taken its fair share of development and I am extremely disappointed that such a beautiful part of the countryside next to and behind us has been earmarked for yet more houses. The plans are a disaster and unsustainable in a place of great beauty where farming is of such excellent quality.</p> <p>2.The project, including 2500 homes, would fill in the majority of the land between Haverhill, Kedington & Calford Green with the loss of prime agricultural land. I feel that Haverhill has many more sites far more suitable than Great Wilsey Farm and feel that this is the wrong location and they should look elsewhere. Building here is highly intrusive into the homes and lives of hundreds of people who chose to live here because it is on the edge of such wonderful countryside, not because they wanted to be penned in by 2,500 houses.</p>	The principle of bringing this area forward to meet the strategic growth needs of Haverhill for the next 20 years was established by the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy which was adopted on 2010 following an examination in public by an independent Inspector. Alternative sites were considered at that time. The amenity value of the land identified in these comments is recognised and acknowledged. The revised Concept Statement for the site addresses many of the issues raised, but cannot overcome the fundamental objection to development.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Brigitte Heard					3. The area is used by a great many people, not only from Great Wilsey and Roman Way, but many locals for general walking, cycling, joggers, dog walkers, and children can play there safely because of there being no traffic. It is a beautiful area with many miles of footpaths and walks through the fields, meadows and woods with abundant wildlife - birds, deer, foxes, rabbits, hares, bats, newts and badgers to name but a few. It is a piece of heaven for a huge amount of people and to build on this land would be devastating for the hundreds of people and the wildlife that enjoy using this open space.		
	Brigitte Heard					4. When there is so much scrubland and available land on the Cambridge side, right near the bypass and a major road, surely it makes much more sense to build here where you are not taking up land that is utilised for the pleasure and purpose of recreational use as is Wilsey Farm. Also you would not be building behind other houses and 'penning' them in as will happen to residents of Wilsey Farm and Roman Way. People bought houses there to be on the edge of the countryside, not to be placed in the middle of 2,500 other houses. What will this do to the houses prices here? There is no justification for continuing the over-development of our countryside without taking account of local people's needs. The loss of prime agricultural land, the impact on public services and the absence of any proof of need for 2,500 dwellings leaves us wondering whether St Edmundsbury Borough Council appreciate what they are suggesting.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Brigitte Heard					<p>5. The impact on public services in this area that are already stretched, and the main A143 road and Chalkstone Way would not meet the demands of the extra traffic from 2,500 houses.</p> <p>6. There is no justification for Haverhill to build 2,500 new homes when every week we have up to 25 pages of houses of all differing types for sale in the local paper. Certainly this does not signify a shortage of housing! This smacks more of a money making scheme for the landowner and the council.</p> <p>7. Access onto Chalkstone Way would be a complete disaster, especially at times when the schools start and finish. As well as two schools, we also have the main Community Football ground here which is used most days and evenings and parking spills over onto Chalkstone Way. These sites are all within a quarter mile distance and already create traffic problems without one of the schools even being open yet! This road is a basic housing estate road and as such would certainly not accommodate the expected quantity of vehicular movements of this application.</p>		
	Brigitte Heard					<p>8. The noise of the extra traffic and population would also cause all sorts of anti-social and behavioral problems.</p> <p>9. How will the needs of the people in these extra 2,500 homes (possibly up to 5,300 people) be met? Where are the plans for extra public services - doctors, dentists, schools, libraries? Haverhill as a town is just not big enough to support this influx of people.</p> <p>10. The noise and disruption of ongoing building work to this area over a long period of time would be horrendous for all the residents from the length of Chalkstone Way, Green Road, the Wilsey estate and Roman Way.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				no	16.2 The broad red arrow on the map accompanying this para. does not give a true understanding of the area of proposed strategic growth. It does not go from the centre of the proposed area. It implies that the direction of growth will be on a NE axis towards Wratting, whereas on the map on page 70 it shows a SE axis stretching right down to Calford Green. A comment re the penultimate sentence in 16.2 (landowner preferred option) is made under Appendix 3 Ref 16.4 a, the words 'Calford Green' should be included. Ref 16.5 The concept statement for the area must realistically and honestly address the four identified challenge points listed in this section, in particular 16.5a 'preventing the coalescence of development with Calford Green'. Ref 16.6 Bullet 1 'north' should be changed to 'north and north east'.	The concerns relating to the impact of proposed development upon the setting of the hamlet of Calford Green are acknowledged. The Concept Statement for NE Haverhill has been significantly amended to address these concerns and create an effective green buffer.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
	Barbara Surridge					Ref. the - views from Calford Green will be mitigated - They will not be mitigated unless the SE boundary of proposed housing is moved further back to the NW - ideally to a line running GR689 462 (Great Wilsey) to GR 685 458 (Chalkstone). There are only two fields between Calford Green and Haverhill now and a buffer zone cannot effectively be any narrower than this. (See attached statement and comments on Appendix 3)		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15732	Mr & Mrs Burnett				no	<p>We would like to formally advise you of our objections to the proposed development in North East Haverhill. We have listed each reason below.</p> <p>1. Effect on wildlife. This large area houses deer, owls, woodpeckers, Badgers, Rabbits, Hares, Various birds nesting in the trees, newts, frogs, toads, bats. Many established trees, including Oak. Most of these animals would not survive if the area was made rural and could not live amongst people</p> <p>2. Noise pollution. We currently reside in a very quiet part of the town. The building works alone will cause a lot of noise and disruption to this area. This would only continue with a large housing estate and increased traffic noise.</p> <p>3. Increased traffic, unsuitable road infrastructure. Chalkstone way is not suitable to support the large increase in traffic that this site would create. I understand there is a proposal for a road near Calford Green but it would be unused if people are intending to drive to the town centre, or out of town towards Cambridge, Bury St Edmunds or Newmarket.</p>	<p>Development of any kind is likely to have an impact upon wildlife, but it need not be negative. It is acknowledged that some species do not tolerate human habitation, but many thrive, particularly where the correct habitat is created. This is acknowledged by the revised Concept Statement which seeks to improve biodiversity through the creation of inter-connected habitats and open space.</p> <p>There will be increased noise levels during construction, but the resulting development need be no noisier than existing development.</p> <p>Although a connection will be required to Chalkstone Way, the principal access will be to Wratting Road and an alternative access can be provided to Samuel Ward Academy. Traffic wishing to access Cambridge, Newmarket and Bury St Edmunds would have no need to use Chalkstone Way and traffic currently using Chalkstone Way to access schools may use the alternative route.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15732	Mr & Mrs Burnett				<p>4. Lack of employment opportunities. Jobs in Haverhill and surrounding villages are few & far between, with applications for jobs far exceeding vacancies available. Increasing the population by approx 5,000 adults will add to this problem. The proposed new businesses will not create no where near enough jobs.</p> <p>5. Increased population unsuitable for Haverhill. Many of the shops on the high street have closed due to the current economical climate. There is not the infrastructure in this town to support an increase in population of up to 10,000 people</p> <p>6. Our views. We moved to Haverhill from North London to get away from a largely populated area with a lack of school spaces and little or no opportunities for quality living. We purchased our house because whilst we are still part of a town we have beautiful views of the countryside. Access to lovely walks on which our daughter can see wildlife, not in a zoo. This housing development would not only take away our lovely views and countryside walks, but possibly create a deprived, over populated area.</p> <p>7. Where will you get the people to fill these 2,500 dwellings?</p>	<p>4. Lack of employment opportunities. Jobs in Haverhill and surrounding villages are few & far between, with applications for jobs far exceeding vacancies available. Increasing the population by approx 5,000 adults will add to this problem. The proposed new businesses will not create no where near enough jobs.</p> <p>5. Increased population unsuitable for Haverhill. Many of the shops on the high street have closed due to the current economical climate. There is not the infrastructure in this town to support an increase in population of up to 10,000 people</p> <p>6. Our views. We moved to Haverhill from North London to get away from a largely populated area with a lack of school spaces and little or no opportunities for quality living. We purchased our house because whilst we are still part of a town we have beautiful views of the countryside. Access to lovely walks on which our daughter can see wildlife, not in a zoo. This housing development would not only take away our lovely views and countryside walks, but possibly create a deprived, over populated area.</p> <p>7. Where will you get the people to fill these 2,500 dwellings?</p>	<p>The Vision document makes provision for additional employment opportunities in all sectors, through regeneration and growth of the town centre and provision of additional employment land including the research park.</p> <p>Current vacancy rates for retail premises are very low despite the national economic climate and well below national and regional averages. However, this plan is looking forward over a time period of 20 years.</p> <p>The concept statement which supports the proposed development will ensure the countryside walks are retained and enhanced and new schools will be provided to meet need. New development is not synonymous with over-population or deprivation. Much of the demand for new housing comes from within the town, but it is acknowledged that people choose to move to Haverhill from places such as North London. We cannot prevent this, neither would we wish to.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				no	Changes which were previously proposed to the developer by consensus of consultation groups have been ignored. These are: 1. No urban development in the triangle between calford Green, The Wilsey Estate and Coupals Road. This to become country parkland linked to the new estate and the great wood through green corridors, alongside the stream. This would provide an extension of East Town Park due to its location. 2. No road access from the development onto the Coupals Road, both dangerous due to the limitations of the Coupals Road and principally as it would cut through the proposed parkland area. 3. The existing woodland on the south west border of the site should be protected and its complete integrity maintained. Therefore it should be excluded from the development area.	Two of these changes have been incorporated into the revised Concept Statement. However, the road link has been retained, but amended to join Coupals Road where it is made up with footpaths and with a change of priority. The need, or otherwise for this link is addressed in the Concept Statement.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
HVR15847	Shaun Hazlewood				no	You are proposing an access road onto Coupals road which I think should not be allowed to go ahead. This road is extremely narrow, barely able to take two cars side by side. If the access road is allowed to go ahead, the road will become very dangerous due to the volume of traffic likely to use that route. At the end of the day it would create a convenient route in all directions, so it will be used heavily. Drainage and sewers. We seem to already have a problem with the water supply system in Roman Way. We regularly have a massive water leak at the bottom of Roman Way which the water authority seem unable to permanently fix. We recently had some kind of burst main event locally which ultimately led to Anglian Water flooding the side of my house with inappropriate use of a hydrant. I am concerned that the existing system will not be able to cope and I can't find anything in your documentation to suggest this has been adequately considered.	The revised Concept Statement addresses the need or otherwise for this road link. If it is required, an alternative location is proposed, avoiding the narrow lane and connecting with Coupals Road where it is made up with footpaths and with a change of priority. Anglian Water are responsible for water supply and have not advised of any problems with supply for the area.	Concept Statement has been amended to address some of these concerns.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Shaun Hazlewood					I would like to see the existing tree line between the Roman Way development, where I live and the new development enhanced (Made thicker) to create some separation between our currently quiet estate with countryside views and the new estate. I am terrified that you plan to remove trees in order to squeeze in a few more houses. Please reassure me this isn't true? I would like to see a substantial amount of decent quality larger properties included in the proposal, preferably located towards the tree line separating them from Roman Way.	The Concept Statement makes it clear that the existing tree belts and woodlands are to be retained, with additional planting. To create a balanced community, a mix of housing is proposed, including larger houses. It is suggested that these would be suitably located at the south eastern part of the site.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
HVR15850	Michael Surridge				no	Point 16.5d should state that planting of natural screening etc. should take place WELL before any building work commences. The boundary of the proposed area is along Mary Coles Grove, private woodland, thus making this vulnerable to abuse. Appendix 3- Sustainability Development Principles Para 6 statement re communal shared waste etc is meaningless to a lay person and needs clarification.	The revised Concept Statement does seek the provision of landscaping before building work commences. Appendix 3 has been superseded by the revised Concept Statement	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
HVR15852	The Principal and Chair of Governors, Castle Partnership Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College.	Castle Partnership c/o Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15854	Mrs Jo Gurteen				no	<p>Please see my points in question 6.</p> <p>There to be no wind turbines as bad for health, therefore contrary to Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is too close to Calford Green, there is not enough space between to retain its character, to consider its community and historical value.</p> <p>Wildlife to the south of Wilsey Farm and across to the East would be too adversely affected. There is little woodland, streams and brooks left in the area. Migrating Geese and ducks always settle on the south east extremity and deer presently roam from cotton hall valley to the east, over to Calford Green and Woodland Green to the west and even beyond in Autumn.</p> <p>It is one thing retaining woodland, but this will not keep the wildlife once a hundred homes are built close to it.</p>	<p>There are no proposals for wind turbines. However, such provision would not be contrary to the Core Strategy and would have to be considered on the merits of any proposal. The revised Concept Statement acknowledges the impact upon Calford Green and has moved the development westward.</p> <p>Development of any kind is likely to have an impact upon wildlife, but it need not be negative. It is acknowledged that some species do not tolerate human habitation,</p>	<p>Concept Statement has been amended to address some of these concerns.</p>
	Mrs Jo Gurteen					<p>The Recreational Ground and the town centre is simply too far away, this will absolutely mean people will get in cars to travel to town. If they do this, then they will often make the decision to drive to Cambridge and on.</p> <p>If you were to ask the residents of Calford Green or Kedington if they walk into town you will find they do not.it is not as workable as other sites. There should certainly be a cut off with no development East or South East of Wilsey Farm.</p> <p>The proposal reads'to the North East', when Calford Green is clearly South and South East of the town Centre.</p> <p>Terrible access to main roads and bypasses, there are no options on this site to improve it enough for this size of development.</p> <p>It is a 'corridor', with the extremities to the north and east being too far from town and working places.</p> <p>There is recreational and amenity land underutilised at present;</p> <p>East town park, Bowls Club, Playing field to south east of Chalkstone way/Sturmer Rd, Numerous sites along Chalkstone Way. Many Public houses closed down and plenty of land along the present and future bypass.</p>	<p>but many thrive, particularly where the correct habitat is created. This is acknowledged by the revised Concept Statement which seeks to improve biodiversity through the creation of inter-connected habitats and open space.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15866	Christine Hart				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				yes	No I think that this area is far too big and will become a dormitory of Haverhill. It will not be integrated just one huge estate.	Although a large area in total, it will not all be developed at once. The masterplan approach should identify smaller neighbourhoods, each with its own identity.	No changes required
HVR15873	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly	n/a	yes	<p>Paragraph 16.5</p> <p>Paragraph 16.5 sets out four key challenges in bringing forward the new neighbourhood at north-east Haverhill. The first of these 'a' is preventing the coalescence of development with Calford Green.</p> <p>In respect of coalescence and the new neighbourhood, in drawing up the landowner's preferred option concept plan consideration has been given to maintaining the identity of Kedington and Little Wrattling (both of which are specifically named in Policy CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy) and also Calford Green. While preventing the coalescence of the new neighbourhood with Calford Green is one of the challenges to be addressed in bringing forward the development, recognition should also be made in Action 'a' to the challenges of preventing coalescence with Kedington and Little Wrattling as well.</p>	These comments have been taken into account in drafting the revised Concept Statement.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these issues.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly			<p>As such, Action 'a' should be reworded to read;</p> <p>'a preventing the coalescence of development with the surrounding settlements.'</p> <p>Landowner's Preferred Option Concept Plan</p> <p>The landowner's preferred option concept plan, a derivation of which has been included in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document, included the following aspects, some of which were incorporated as a result of stakeholder comments made during the Issues and Options consultation in March 2011:</p> <p>(1) structural landscaping around all of the rural-urban edge of the development</p> <p>(2) additional green linkages throughout the new neighbourhood</p> <p>(3) landscape buffers, particularly along the interface between the new neighbourhood and the existing urban edge</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Karen Beech BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Bidwells	Mrs Pelly			(4) One primary school proposed to be located in the central community hub, with a second primary school, if there is a demonstrated need, proposed in the community hub to the north of the new neighbourhood. Land to the immediate north of the Samuel Ward Academy is not proposed as a primary school, as shown on the concept plan in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document, but is proposed to be used for education purposes associated with the Samuel Ward Academy. The concept plan included in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document is a strategic 'overview' plan and some of the points made above represent detailed information that will be considered at the next stage of the planning process. However it is considered that some aspects, such as the structural planting along the edge of the proposed development, and the primary school location(s) should at this early stage be shown on the concept plan		
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				yes	See my reply to question 6	The concern at question 6 related to the extent of development to the east in the direction of Calford and Woodland Green. Amendments to the Concept Plan should address this concern.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns..
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15883	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15890	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property	Nick Davey	The JTS Partnership LLP	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR15964	John Swan				no	The whole line of the N.E. should be brought in towards Haverhill, to protect the rural character of Lt. Wrattling, Kedington and Calford Green.	The line has been changed to protect the relationship with Calford Green. Other changes are not considered necessary.	Concept Statement has been amended to address some of these concerns.

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council				<p>In response to question 35 and relating to the North-east Strategic growth Area, Sturmer Parish Council wishes to express the following reservations and objections;</p> <p>Para 16.4 In the preparation of the concept statement and masterplan the maintenance of the identity and segregation of Sturmer must be considered.</p> <p>Para 16.5 Positive measures must be included which prevent the gradual coalescence of the development with the village of Sturmer. These measures must also include the minimisation of the impact of the built development upon the Essex countryside.</p> <p>Para 16.6</p>	These comments have been taken into account in drafting the revised Concept Statement.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council				<p>The Parish Council is strongly opposed to the suggestion that an access road should be included, as part of the development, to allow traffic from the new development onto Coupals Road and potentially into Sturmer Village via the B1061. we feel this road access must be the subject of a traffic impact assessment and must be considered by Essex County Council Transportation and Highways Department and braintree District Council's Department of Sustainable Development.</p> <p>Appendix 3. Development Principles. Access routes.</p> <p>Coupals Road and the B1061 Sturmer to Kedington Road are already known locally as 'rat runs' in and around Haverhill, Sturmer and Kedington and Sturmer Parish Council feels that a further access road onto this network will serve only to exacerbate the current problems of h.g.v. use as well as the inappropriate use of sat. nav. information when vehicles try to avoid the town centre.</p>	The revised Concept Statement addresses the need or otherwise for the road link. If it is required, an alternative location is proposed, avoiding the narrow lane and connecting with Coupals Road where it is made up with footpaths and with a change of priority.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council				One of the delivery principles will involve the development and preparation of the detailed masterplan for the site in which the local community and other stakeholders will be involved. Sturmer Parish Council looks forward to playing a full and active part in this process and trusts that its' views on the development will be given full consideration throughout the process.		
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			no	16.2 The broad red arrow on the map accompanying this para. does not give a true understanding of the area of proposed strategic growth. It does not go from the centre of the proposed area. It implies that the direction of growth will be on a NE axis towards Wratting, whereas on the map on page 70 it shows a SE axis stretching right down to Calford Green. A comment re the penultimate sentence in 16.2 (landowner preferred option) is made under Appendix 3 Ref 16.4 a, the words 'Calford Green' should be included. Ref 16.5 The concept statement for the area must realistically and honestly address the four identified challenge points listed in this section, in particular 16.5a 'preventing the coalescence of development with Calford Green'.	The concerns relating to the impact of proposed development upon the setting of the hamlet of Calford Green are acknowledged. The Concept Stetment for NE Haverhill has been significantly amended to address these concerns and create an effective green buffer.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents				Ref 16.6 Bullet 1 'north' should be changed to 'north and north east'. Ref. the 'views from Calford Green will be mitigated' They will not be mitigated unless the SE boundary of proposed housing is moved further back to the NW ideally to a line running GR689 462 (Great Wilsey) to GR 685 458 (Chalkstone). There are only two fields between Calford Green and Haverhill now and a buffer zone cannot effectively be any narrower than this.		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16008	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane [South] and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.10, page 7 of the Haverhill 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 2031 process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the general expansion of the Borough and its promotion as a growth area. Steps should be taken to reduce the planned numbers of dwellings across Haverhill and the Borough as a whole, to more moderate levels. The Core Strategy should be revisited and the expansion plans to the Borough changed to accord with residents' views. There is no legal obligation to continue with the housing targets imposed by the East of England Regional Authority. Any development of this site should meet the approval of the local residents, including the final number of dwellings to be built. Development of Brownfield sites must first be exhausted before any Greenfield sites are considered for development.	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 31, page 65 of Haverhill Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under the Bury 2031 Vision (Page 72, Question 41 of that document) A further hard copy of our petition was submitted with that submission. In our letter to the Council of 28th April 2011, we also laid out our broad concerns regarding expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16014	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council, Economy, Skills and Environment				The county council does not oppose this allocation (barring our comments on the scheduled monument, above), and will work with the borough council and the developer to ensure that all infrastructure requirements are met. For example, 2,500 homes will generate 438 11-16 age group pupils and 88 sixth form students. This would be within the Samuel Ward Academy catchment boundary and so significant investment would be required at that school. We will contribute to the development of detailed transport proposals as part of full discussions on transport solutions for the whole of Haverhill.	Thank you for your observations.	No changes required
HVR20970E	Cllr Patrick Hanlon	Haverhill Town Council			no	There should be two main access points along Haverhill/Wrattling Road and one minor access from Coupals Road, or a road that would join at the Haverhill by-pass at Sturmer and give back land to the golf club. Chalkstone Way should not be an access, already too much traffic because there will be three big schools and already a large amount of housing on a mile long road.	There is a highway requirement for three points of access. Should this change for any reason, relevant changes can be made to the road links. This is addressed in the revised Concept Statement This cannot be achieved simply by adding two two accesses onto the same stretch of road. However, the concerns relating to the proposed access to Coupals Road are acknowledged and the Concept Statement has been amended.	Concept Statement has been amended to address some of these concerns.
HVR20999E	Chad				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				no	5, Road should be from the Wrattling Road to the Sturmer roundabout this would be a barrier for Keddington and Calford Green. With Three large schools, a football ground and an already large housing estate Chalkstone Way would not cope with so much traffic. Coupals Road is too small to cope with buses and cars.	There is no evidence to support the need for such a road, which is why it was removed from the Core Strategy prior to adoption.	No changes required
HVR21323E	C M Mascot				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21390E	Mrs Pauline Henderson Gray				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				no	This is prime agricultural land with a high yield in crops. It should never have been considered for redevelopment which was only done to assist the landowner in her retirement plans.	The principle of developing this area of land was established by the adoption of the Core Strategy on 2010. The location was decided following detailed consideration of many sites around the town and was subject to detailed analysis at an independent inspection.	No changes required
HVR21518E	Nicholas Hindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21534E	Jagtar Rai				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			yes	A very considered plan taking into consideration the contours of the land and the way people like to live. A lot of care has been taken to learn from national historical planning successes and mistakes.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott					NEED TO KEEP SPACE,PLAY AREAS KEEP TRAFFIC LOW	These issues are addressed in the revised Concept Statement	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
HVR21646E	Deanna Sergent				no	DEFINITELY NOT "IN MY BACKYARD" or anyone else's backyard if it means building on greenfield sites	The principle of developing this area of land was established by the adoption of the Core Strategy on 2010, There is insufficient land available within the existing built up area of Haverhill to meet the identified needs.	No changes required
HVR21667E	Rachel Hutchinson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
HVR21676E	Jason				no	Why is the development needed? Houses in town aren't selling, there are no school places for 5 year olds, shop units are empty and there are no jobs. Do we need more people moving into the area?	The Vision document is looking at the needs of Haverhill for the next 20 years, not just the present moment.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				no	16.2 The broad red arrow on the map accompanying this para. does not give a true understanding of the area of proposed strategic growth. It does not go from the centre of the proposed area. It implies that the direction of growth will be on a NE axis towards Wratting, whereas on the map on page 70 it shows a SE axis stretching right up to Calford Green. A comment re the penultimate sentence in 16.2 (landowner preferred option) is made under Appendix 3 Ref 16.4 a, the words Calford Green should be included. Ref 16.5 The concept statement for the area must realistically and honestly address the four identified challenge points listed in this section, in particular 16.5a preventing the coalescence of development with Calford Green.	The concerns relating to the impact of proposed development upon the setting of the hamlet of Calford Green are acknowledged. The Concept Statement for NE Haverhill has been significantly amended to address these concerns and create an effective green buffer.	Concept Statement has been amended to address these concerns.
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield					Ref 16.6 Bullet 1 north should be changed to north and north east. Ref. the views from Calford Green will be mitigated They will not be mitigated unless the SE boundary of proposed housing is moved further back to the NW - ideally to a line running GR689 462 (Great Wilsey) to GR 685 458 (Chalkstone). There are only two fields between Calford Green and Haverhill now and a buffer zone cannot effectively be any narrower than this. In addition to these comments a major concern to the residents of Calford Green, Kedington & Sturmer is the inevitable increase in traffic. None of the existing roads (Coupals Road, the B1061 and the A143) and their junctions, can cope with additional traffic and are already extremely hazardous.	The proposed development should not have any significant impact on traffic using the B1061 or coupals Road east of the development area. There is no evidence to suggest that the A143 is anywhere near capacity.	
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				no	<p>No hard evidence on need for the extent of housing proposed in Haverhill.</p> <p>I notice that Kedington Parish Council does not appear on the published list of consultees for the Haverhill Action Plan, yet organisations as far as Cambridgeshire and Essex were. Since the proposed development spills onto land which is in the Parish of Kedington, this would have been appropriate.</p> <p>Presumably it was the consultees who were invited to the original feedback session [1.42] that was held at the end of the assessment of the output from the Princes FoundationTrust Community Capital Framework work which then were used to inform the objectives and visions of Haverhill. Who was in this group & why does this supersede local views ?</p> <p>Why was this new tool introduced and used to over ride the consultation feedback from the official consultation with the people of Haverhill which ended on 1st April. Is this a joke ? !</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 Prince's Trust work involved local people and forms just one element of the consultation and does not over ride any other consultation feedback.	No changes required

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					<p>Action plan needs to be based on more than a hunch if it is to be used to justify 5000 new homes, many to be built on Greenfield land outside the development boundary and in a town without jobs to support them.</p> <p>Action plan should be more about regeneration of the Town than of extending it. Previous economic development and regeneration proposals indicated that neighbourhood renewal funding would be concentrated on the most deprived areas. In order to meet the needs of the people of Haverhill, I suggest that the Haverhill action plan should also concentrate on this, first.</p> <p>The landowners masterplan for NE is a reasonable one, assuming that the plan is justified on the basis of realistic local needs however all projections do make this very big assumption, and the plan misses the opportunity to add an amenity green recreational space to tackle inequality and to improve health closest to housing HV4b which will be lacking when new development goes ahead leaving existing residents without amenity land close by.</p>	<p>The Haverhill Vision 2031 is a comprehensive document which addresses wide range of issues for Haverhill over the next 20 years, not just housing growth. Regeneration of areas is potentially an ongoing process, but this will not address provision of jobs, homes and services for the growing population.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					<p>We have not seen much evidence of the need for housing in Haverhill to support jobs in Haverhill. The jobs/housing imbalance is excessive and there clearly need to be efforts to address that before further population expansion. The High Tech employment site proposed at the Cambridge side of town will help but not necessarily generate significant number of jobs for local people.</p> <p>The significant and rapid over supply of housing with the significant under supply of jobs and continued decline in the manufacturing sector, has forced occupants of the town and wider area to travel further to work. This has caused significant inequality in the job market for all who are deprived and not able to operate their own car.</p> <p>Bury accounts for 64% of boroughs jobs, Haverhill only 17% of which manufacturing forms the biggest sector (in decline), so over expanding the Haverhill area any greater than this ratio will force the population of Haverhill to continue to travel further for work on its fatally dangerous trunk road network.</p>	<p>People will continue to choose Haverhill 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. This includes broadening the range of employment opportunities, encouraging retail, service and research sectors in addition to the traditional employment sectore.</p>	
	Nathan Loader					<p>Transport is responsible for a large proportion of carbon emissions This development therefore conflicts with National Policy Guidance on Transport because it does not reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs. A1307 is not safe (deaths every year 10 years on stretch from Haverhill to Cambridge). Cambridge is not close or easy to access, particularly by bus. Despite the emphasis given to encouraging sustainable transport movements, it is not expected that most commuters will do so by any other method than by car so the road link to Cambridge needs to be made safe and not just slower.</p>	<p>The Vision document seeks to redress the jobs/homes balance by the creation of a wider range of job types.</p> <p>We are seeking to improve bus srvcies to make it a viable and realistic alternative.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					<p>During the environmental impact assessment of the Core Strategy, the transport assessment only looked at distances traveled by St Edmundsbury occupants to work where there destinations of travel fell within the borough of St Edmundsbury. This is a significant failure. Some of the statistics given, which are well out of date also seem dubious!.The joint development DMP Sustainability Appraisal states available data suggests that the distance that residents commute to work is significantly higher than the national mean.</p> <p>Haverhill Action plan should address this by commissioning an up to date transport assessment to determine the workplace destinations of the working Haverhill population to evaluate the likely detrimental environmental impact caused by significant levels of additional out commuters from housing in Haverhill. The St Edmundsbury LDF Haverhill Transport Impacts Assessment is based on out of date statistics from 2001 and we have seen how the working patterns of the local economy can change in 10 years.</p>	The Transport Assessment looked at where residents of Haverhill travelled to work. Given that this plan is for Haverhill, it is a reasonable approach to take. Planning cannot control where people work, it can only influence travel patterns by creating a better balance of homes, jobs and services.	
	Nathan Loader					<p>This then needs to be reviewed by the same planning inspector who evaluated the Core Strategy and cross checked for soundness.</p> <p>For those who have jobs, the amount of time spent commuting to work has effected their quality family and leisure time and has contributed to the relatively poor health of the local population. Any further development of housing in Haverhill will increase the economic, health and wellbeing problems of Haverhill residents unless the number of jobs are first increased to meet the current demand for jobs of the population. Houses should only be increased in Haverhill when the economic assessment can justify the need for such houses in the town and area. Yes, the Haverhill Vision adds to employment land, however, this is required even without new housing.</p>	Haverhill Research Park is being developed now. Land is available, but companies will not move to a town without homes for employees.	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					<p>Regarding the ring road, if there was insufficient evidence to now support this need, why was it offered as a strategic objective ? The Core Strategy Policy Growth for Haverhill CS12 stated that the northeast site will need to deliver a north-east relief road for Haverhill between the A134 and the A1017 and the local distributor road network and this was based on the SEBC LDF Transport Impacts report for Haverhill. The reason that the ring road is important is that it would act as a final undisputable buffer zone (on the Haverhill side of the ridge) to prevent further outward creep of the town because we know that natural buffer zones can be moved over time.</p> <p>Are other strategic objectives based upon similar insufficient evidence to support the needs ?</p>	The Core Strategy and Policy CS12 do not require the delivery of a north-east relief road. The issue was considered fully during the examination in public for the Core Strategy in 2010. There was no evidence to support the need then and the situation has not changed.	
	Nathan Loader					<p>We have heard a lot about the proximity to Cambridge. The Cambridge Sub Region Study or the Buchanan Report was a major study which looked at the capacity and impacts of development options and was used by SEBC during previous Haverhill Vision exercises in terms of sustainability criteria and implementation. Although the regional spatial strategies may have now been dropped, the underlying sustainability research and recommendations should still be valid. I understand that the Buchanan report recommended that in order to maintain its rural integrity, settlements should have a clear separation distance from an encroaching town.</p> <p>In order to protect the Hamlet of Calford Green from coalescence a landscape character assessment should be made of the area between the existing settlement boundary of Haverhill and the settlement of Calford Green, which can then be used to ensure it maintains its distinctive identity.</p>		

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					<p>Due to the sequential approach to development, the town centre masterplan should be implemented before any building takes place on Greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Urban Capacity Study which identified the need for development which underpinned the previous development plan was based on research carried out in 2001 and, therefore, is no longer valid. Since this is at the heart of the approach, this research should be renewed if it is to provide robust justification to underpin the Haverhill Vision.</p> <p>The LDF Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan states To meet this requirement, independent consultants were appointed to undertake an Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) in mid 2008. However, this document was purely a projection about the likely infrastructure that might be required to support housing growth and does not relate to Urban Capacity for dwellings.</p>	<p>There is no justifiable reason why the town centre masterplan should take precedence over the provision of homes. Agree that the Urban Capacity Study is out of date. It has been superceded by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which is regularly updated and published and identifies limited opportunities.</p>	

Haverhill Vision 2031
Question 35: North-east Haverhill

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the Preferred Option for the development of North-east Haverhill site?	Question 35b - Would you recommend any changes to the preferred option?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Nathan Loader					I notice plans to remove the Urban Edge because apparently there is no policy for this. However, there is a planning policy and guidance for development it is called a settlement boundary. An area action plan should plan for development within that area. I think that the Core Strategy misled people because it was not made clear at the time that the proposed development in North East of Haverhill would be so far outside the development boundary. Maps have failed to show the existing settlement boundary so peoples comments would have been shaped on the basis that this land was within Haverhill. No information on the exact location of development were available at the time of the Core Strategy consultation despite references that were made to an attached Plan which were missing. Leaving this ambiguity until the Haverhill Action plan at which point commitments appear to have already been made, is inadequate if this is a key objective. For a key objective to be so, it must be clear and obvious.	The process of preparing LDF documents and in particular, a Core Strategy did not permit definition of sites. Such sites would be defined by a more in depth process of producing Area Action Plans, which is what has been achieved through the Haverhill Vision 2031 document.	
	Nathan Loader					The Haverhill Action plan should ensure that through design, the housing identified can be fitted within the land available inside the settlement boundary. Since the highest demand for housing is going to be low cost housing for increasing numbers of young, increasingly deprived and unemployed perhaps higher density housing may be the most sustainable and economically viable. The second largest need for housing is going to be for the ageing population who will need sheltered accommodation and care homes. This too could be relatively high density and carefully designed for community cohesion. Since the North West site is going to come first, perhaps this should be implemented first and if this approach is combined with utilizing brownfield town centre sites suitable for regenerating the town, then it may well be possible that the levels of decent homing for the needs of Haverhill could be met without the North East needing to breach the perimeter.	The Vision document provides for a range of housing to serve all tenures and types. Although housing will be an important element, there are few opportunities in the town centre for housing, if the town is also to be an attractive shopping and leisure destination.	

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				As you know I support your goals in setting out a long term vision, and strongly support the very wide amount of consultation you are going through. It is very important people feel they are having a say in the process, and you have been very open in encouraging that. I also agree with your broad strategy for development: incremental growth in villages, in keeping with local heritage and mindful of local amenities, and strong growth of both housing and commercial allocations in Haverhill, which is a growing, increasingly vibrant, up and coming town.	Your support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15703	Mr G J Winchester				I would like to make a couple of points whilst this work is ongoing: 1. The road kept clean and free of mud 2. Proper safe access for ambulance etc to the sixty dwellings often needed 3. The boundary wall to stop children sitting on it. I can assure you I look forward to the dwellings. I also hope one of your reps will supervise the project.	Not sure which site this relates to, however, the general principles would apply to all sites.	No changes required
HVR15705	Mr & Mrs M Roake				Please find enclosed local objection to the development of the land on the corner of Millfields Way and Kestrel Road (HV4b). The development of this site will also affect a much wider range of surrounding residents.	This site already benefits from planning permission for development, although it is as yet unimplemented.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15721	David Hussell				<p>Churches Together has no objections or adverse comments to make and in fact welcomes the initiative of the Borough Council to create long term and effective plans to guide the continuing prosperity, growth and success, in all the important ways, for these two towns.</p> <p>For Haverhill, and in particular the larger proposed expansion to the north east of the town, we have, through the agents Bidwells, started active discussions with the landowner Mrs Pelly as well as initiating dialogue with the local clergy, with the view to identifying the religious accommodation needs of future inhabitants. It is likely that some form of new local church accommodation will be required within the north east expansion.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15727	Barbara Richardson				<p>I writing regarding the letter we received about Wisdom Factory Site.</p> <p>As we live at the bottom of Colne Valley Road we are concerned about these proposals. Surly parts of the building, i.e. the offices are under the conservation rule the same as our house which faces Hamlet Road and the side Colne Valle Road, or are these rules relaxed to suit?</p> <p>Are you able to advise how many houses will be built and also the access routes? There have been enough opposition about the proposed houses and the old Hamlet Groft Football grounds due to the amount of traffic that will be coming out to Hamlet Road, and now with this proposal it will be even worse!!</p> <p>I would strongly oppose if the access route comes down the bottom of Colne Valley Road, especial when there is LAMPH which is a playgroup and of course the Scouts but also due to the build up of traffic.</p>	<p>Before any development is proposed for this site, all the the concerns raised will need to be addressed. The existing Victorian office building is particular importance to the character of the area, but not the general industrial buildings. At present the site takes all access from Colne Valley Road, but potential exists for access to Duddery Hill. All options will need to be explored. The nature and scale of development will be the subject of further work and consultation.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15731	Peter Thomas				I'm very concerned about the areas that may be affected, we live in kirtling place, just off Chalkstone way. We moved up here 7 years ago from London to live by the countryside. Since we've we've been here houses have been built on what was good habitat for wildlife, then a football stadium was built though that hasn't been a problem really but now we have that awful looking new school being built on a third of what was a much nicer looking wheat field. Looking at the vision plans it looks to me like the rest of that field and beyond is being looked at to be turned into more bricks and mortar.	Development of any kind is likely to have an impact upon wildlife, but it need not be negative. It is acknowledged that some species do not tolerate human habitation, but many thrive, particularly where the correct habitat is created. This is acknowledged by the revised Concept Statement for development of the strategic growth area, which seeks to improve biodiversity through the creation of inter-connected habitats and open space.	No changes required
	Peter Thomas				Can you confirm if I'm looking at the plans correctly ? If so then I think my days in Haverhill will be numbered, I'm really sick and tired of our lovely countryside being turned into bricks and mortar, not only does it destroy lovely views,walks,fresh air etc etc but has anybody any idea or care what it does to our ever decreasing wildlife? There wont be any wildlife or countryside in time if we keep building,building building, nice villages being turned into towns (like Haverhill) and then the towns being turned into bigger towns with over population and crime problems with less police to deal with them. A vision this may be but will only ruin the town in the long run and its surrounding countryside.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15732	Mr & Mrs Burnett				<p>If it is deemed necessary to provide in excess of 2,500 dwellings in or around Haverhill then there is an adequate amount of space on the entrance to Haverhill (to the right of the 1st roundabout). This is supported by a main road and would provide easy access in & out of Haverhill without disruption to the town and current occupants.</p> <p>We hope that you do take into consideration the thoughts & feelings of existing residents.</p>	The principal access to the strategic growth area will be to the A143. However, the area will require more than one point of access and a key objective is to integrate development. The development will also create community facilities which should be accessible to existing residents.	No changes required
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				This response is supported by a petition containing 350 signatures.		
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				<p>It was very difficult to read the document online. I didn't like the way the 'aspirations' were laid out next to the questions. It was very confusing and I am used to computers. Couldn't read the detailed maps. Having columns meant you had to keep scrolling up and down to read the text instead of the more natural left to right approach.</p> <p>It took one and a half hours to complete scanning the document.</p>	The next version of the document will not include the questions. These concerns will be considered in the design of the next version, but it may still require columns.	Consider these observations in the design of the next version of the document.
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				Re above question - see my reply to question 6	This has been addressed in response to question 6.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				Coupals Road would need to be staightened and widened to accommodate additional traffic. Local residents think more parkland is needed.	This issue is addressed in the revised Concept Statement, which moves the access to Coupals road westward and increases the open space between Haverhill and Calford Green. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required
HVR15884	Mr R Maidment			Haverhill Chamber of Commerce	<p>As the Committee Member responsible for local planning, the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce have asked me to convey their views on 'Haverhill Vision 2031'. They are of the opinion that the overall thrust is generally fair and balanced but, from a commercial viewpoint and at the early stage of the appraisal, it is difficult for the group to make any specific observations. There is, however, the obvious ongoing need for improvement to basic infrastructure and in particular the strategic internal and external road links to and from the town and the town centre.</p> <p>The Chamber hopes this simple observation is of some help and look forward to being more actively involved as the plans progress.</p>	Thank you for your support and observations.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15887	Mick Smith	HAVO			<p>I am Mick Smith and I chair the Haverhill Association of Voluntary Organisations or HAVO. I and my colleague, Michael Simpkin attended your initial consultation at Samuel Wards Upper School a while ago where we made very clear what we in Haverhill wanted with regard to housing development. From what I have seen of the proposed development I wonder why we bothered really even though I understand that a consultation is not in any way a negotiation.</p> <p>Now both my colleague, Michael Simpkin and myself wanted to attend the consultation - that I understand was for invitees only - but we were sent our invite much too late and had other prior engagements to attend on both evenings.</p> <p>Below I have set down some of the things that we both feel very strongly would actually benefit our town and its citizens:</p>	<p>These observations do not explain in what way the views of consultees have been ignored. However, it is acknowledged that some key issues relating to the shape of the strategic growth area expressed at the developer workshops were not incorporated on the concept statement in Chapter 16. These have now been addressed in the revised concept statement.</p>	<p>No further changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mick Smith	HAVO			We both feel strongly that the town ought to expand considerably so as to be large enough to justify all the things we in this town - and those before us too - have been banging on about for years now: Better healthcare facilities like the 'Darzi' centre promised to provide like X Ray facility, a minor surgery unit, consultant rooms, all the things that would have reduced A&E attendances at both the West Suffolk and Addenbrookes hospitals; the provision of a rail connection to Cambridge and Stansted; a much, much larger shopping offer in a very much expanded shopping centre; proper parkland facilities and a good direct connection between the two town parks 'East and West' (my suggestion would be a railway operating just like the Romney Hythe & Dymchurch Railway down in Kent) and the luring of High St names like M&S to our town too.	It is hoped that improved healthcare facilities can be achieved. Clearly the Darzi clinic has now closed, but alternatives are discussed in Chapter 12. This will require ongoing work with the healthcare providers.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mick Smith	HAVO			<p>As for housing development we both agree that a development like the Morton Hall development in Bury St Eds is much needed here in Haverhill and not too distant from our town centre either. The relief road system ought now to be finally dealt with to connect what started out as a relief road and needs now to be completed then another relief road to connect the A143 to the Sturmer Road (A 1017?) so as to relieve our town centre from through traffic that does more harm than good in clogging up our town centre traffic.</p> <p>The agreed principle your officers took away with you from that previous consultation was a connecting road from the east town development to the Sturmer road roundabout and the proper connection of the open land to East Town Park so as to provide a beautiful corridor of nature and walks and so forth that would be a beneficial legacy for many years to come. This was ignored and what we have been left with is a pathetic excuse for a bit of a park!</p>	The issue of a further relief road to connect the A143 with Sturmer was considered and dismissed during examination of the Core Strategy in 2010. The corridor of open land remains, but does not require a road.	No changes required
	Mick Smith	HAVO			I doubt very much whether you will take any notice of this but I have at least benefited by having the right - and exercising that right - to take part in this consultation.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15894	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			Terminology needs to be changed to include 'hamlets' where they are included in a Parish, for example, Calford Green is a hamlet included in the Parish of Kedington (village). Calford Green needs much consideration in respect of the plans for North East Haverhill, as already pointed out by Inspector Moore's statement, 'in the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone, but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the master-planning process'.. It is imperative that small hamlets, like Calford Green and villages like Kedington, are protected and not swallowed up in large scale developments. The Haverhill Vision 2031 should not confine development to North East Haverhill when there are other opportunities for development on land nearer to the Cambridge side of Haverhill.	Throughout the document and within the revised concept statement reference is made to the importance of the setting and separation of Calford Green. Reference to it as a hamlet within the parish of Kedington would not change its status or consideration. The principle of bringing the north east area forward to meet the strategic growth needs of Haverhill for the next 20 years was established by the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy which was adopted on 2010 following an examination in public by an independent Inspector. Alternative sites were considered at that time.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>The development of North East Haverhill would not meet the requirements for walking distances to town centres. There are only two fields between Calford Green and Haverhill at present and a buffer zone between the proposed development and Calford Green should not effectively be an smaller than this and the proposed housing line will be required to be moved back to achieve this.</p> <p>Kedington Parish Council does not appear on the published list of consultees for the Haverhill Action Plan, yet organisations as far as Cambridgeshire and Essex are. Since the proposed development for North East Haverhill spills onto land which is in the Parish of Kedington, this would have been appropriate. Presumably it was the consultees who were invited to the original feedback session (1.42) that was held at the end of the assessment of the output from the Princes Foundation Trust Community Capital Framework, which then were used to inform the objectives and visions of both the Haverhill and Rural Visions 2031.</p>	The walking distances referred to relate to walkable neighbourhoods, not distance from the town centre. The location of the furthest part of the proposed NE Haverhill Strategic Growth Area is closer to the town centre than some existing residential neighbourhoods on the western side of the town.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>Who was in this group and why does this supersede local views? Why was this new tool introduced and used to override the consultation feedback from the official consultation with the people of Haverhill that ended on 1st April?</p> <p>Action Plan needs to be based on more than a 'hunch' if it is to be used to justify 5000 new homes, many to be built on greenfield land outside the development boundary and in a town without jobs to support them. Action Plan should be more about regeneration of the town, than of extending it. There is little evidence of the need for housing in Haverhill to support jobs there; the jobs/housing imbalance is excessive and there clearly needs to be efforts to address this before further population expansion. The significant and rapid over supply of housing with the significant under supply of jobs and continued decline in the manufacturing sector has forced people in Haverhill and wider area to travel further to work.</p>	<p>The Prince's Trust work involved local people and forms just one element of the consultation and does not over ride any other consultation feedback.</p> <p>The Haverhill Vision 2031 is a comprehensive document which addresses wide range of issues for Haverhill over the next 20 years, not just housing growth. Regeneration of areas is potentially an ongoing process, but this will not address provision of jobs, homes and services for the growing population. Haverhill 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. This includes broadening the range of employment opportunities, encouraging retail, service and research sectors in addition to the traditional employment sectors.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>This has caused significant inequality in the job market for all who are deprived and not able to operate their own car. The development in North East Haverhill conflicts with National Policy Guidance on Transport because it does not reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>During the environmental impact assessment of the Core Strategy, the transport assessment only looked at distances travelled by St Edmundsbury occupants to work where their destinations of travel fell within the Borough of St Edmundsbury. This is a significant failure; some of the statistics given, which are well out of date also seem dubious. The joint development DMP Sustainability Appraisal states 'available data suggests that the distance that residents commute to work is significantly higher than the national mean'.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment looked at where residents of Haverhill travelled to work. Given that this plan is for Haverhill, it is a reasonable approach to take. Planning cannot control where people work, it can only influence travel patterns by creating a better balance of homes, jobs and services.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>Haverhill Action Plan should address this by commissioning an up to date transport assessment to determine the workplace destinations of the working population to evaluate the likely detrimental environment impact caused by significant levels of additional out commuters from housing in Haverhill. The St Edmundsbury LDF Haverhill Transport Impacts Assessment is based on out of date statistics from 2001 and it can now be seen how the working patterns of the local economy can change in 10 years. This then needs to be reviewed by the same Planning Inspector who evaluated the Core Strategy and cross checked for soundness.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			There has been a lot said about the proximity to Cambridge. The Cambridge Sub Region Study or the Buchanan Report was a major study which looked at the capacity and impacts of development options and was used by St Edmundsbury Borough Council during previous Haverhill Vision exercises in terms of sustainability criteria and implementation. Although the regional spatial strategies may have now been dropped, the underlying sustainability research and recommendations should still be valid. The Buchanan report recommended that in order to maintain its rural integrity, settlements (villages and hamlets) should have a clear separation distance from an encroaching town. In order to protect the hamlet of Calford Green from coalescence, a landscape character assessment should be made of the area between the existing settlement boundary of Haverhill and the settlement of Calford Green, which can then be used to ensure it maintains its distinctive identity.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			It has been noticed there are plans to remove the Urban Edge because apparently there is no policy for this. However, there is a planning policy and guidance for development - it is called a settlement boundary. An Area Action Plan should plan for development within that area. The Core Strategy misled people because it was not made clear at the time, that the proposed development of North East Haverhill would be so far outside the development boundary and much further than the Parish of Kedington were led to believe. Maps have failed to show the existing settlement boundary so people's comments would have been shaped on the basis that this land was within Haverhill.	The process of preparing LDF documents and in particular, a Core Strategy did not permit definition of sites. Such sites would be defined by a more in depth process of producing Area Action Plans, which is what has been achieved through the Haverhill Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			No information on the exact location of development was available at the time of the Core Strategy consultation, despite references that were made to an attached Plan which was missing. Leaving this ambiguity until the Haverhill Action plan at which point commitments appear to have already been made is inadequate if this is a key objective. For a key objective to be so, it must be clear and obvious. The Haverhill Action Plan should ensure that through design, the housing identified can be fitted within the land available inside the settlement boundary.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15896	Emma Goodings	Braintree District Council			<p>Notwithstanding our concerns set out in our response to question 6 of this questionnaire regarding the extent of the boundary of the site, Braintree District Council is satisfied that at this stage the eastern end of the site, where it abuts Braintree District and the countryside, includes a large area of strategic open space, to reflect the rural character of the areas surrounding the development site. However we would suggest that this open space be continued to the west as there is no urban development on the other side of the proposed development boundary and this will leave an isolated finger of urban development out of character with the countryside which it is surrounded by.</p> <p>We remain concerned about the Coupals Road access point and how far the design of that access point will go to prevent additional traffic using the new road and the roads surrounding it, including those in Sturmer Parish, as a rat run to bypass central Haverhill.</p> <p>We would reiterate our wish to be consulted upon any further progress in the masterplan for this site.</p>	Thank you for your observations. The concept statement for the strategic growth has been amended to take account of your concerns. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15905	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>I do not propose to comment on much of the detail contained within the Haverhill Vision 2031 document as this is rightly the concerns of local residents. However, I do wish to comment on the impact further development in Haverhill will have on the A1307.</p> <p>The introduction to section 2, on page 13, refers to 'strong economic links to Cambridge and a large proportion of residents commute to work in Cambridgeshire'. Paragraph 2.12 refers to 'the high level of out commuting' and that 'it is thought one of the key workplaces attracting Haverhill people is Addenbrookes Hospital'.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.17 goes on to state that 'the A1307 towards Cambridge ... has a poor accident record and is severely congested in places, especially at Linton.'</p> <p>Section 3 considers Haverhill in 2031. Part of paragraph 3.1 states that 'To achieve people's aspirations, in 2031 Haverhill will be a town that has ... 'a diverse employment base with strong links to Cambridge'. As set out in the Core Strategy, Haverhill is likely to have at least 4,260 new homes between 2009 and 2031.</p>	Thank you for your observations and comments. It is acknowledged that a bus caught in congestion has no advantage over a car caught in congestion and that some infrastructure work will be required. This needs to be explored further by the ongoing collaborative work of all of the authorities involved and the support of Cambridgeshire County Council is greatly appreciated.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>The key issue relating to my response is raised in paragraph 6.3: 'Businesses are concerned about congestion on the A1307 which links Haverhill to Cambridge. Agents ... identify poor access as a reason why Cambridge businesses do not move to Haverhill.</p> <p>The document does refer to proposed actions to address issues relating to jobs and employment, for example, paragraph 6.4b 'lobby for improvement of transport links with Cambridge'. I agree that councils, within and outside Suffolk, must work together to lobby for improved transport links, but councils need to be more proactive.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.43 concerns the Princes Foundation Vision Statements, of which c) states 'Haverhill will be connected to ... Addenbrookes and Cambridge ... by high speed dedicated bus services.'</p> <p>I support this vision but high speed buses will not be quick if they are held up by congestion.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	Abingtons Ward			<p>In my view, the Haverhill Vision 2031 document needs to address congestion issues on the A1307 in a manner that is more likely to be successful. To this end the document should include more about how developments in Haverhill need to directly contribute towards the additional congestion that they will cause. Otherwise, the words of paragraph 6.3 will become even more true businesses will not relocate to Haverhill because of congestion on the A1307, so that local growth will eventually strangle itself.</p> <p>I welcome the increased level of collaboration between Suffolk County Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to tackle the issues of safety and congestion on the A1307. My concern is that the Haverhill Vision 2031 is not sufficiently proactive in addressing these issues. Yes concerted lobbying by the councils is important but councils through local developments also have a direct role to play.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>Developments, whether of houses or employment or both have consequences, and we cannot simply hope that government will solve all our problems.</p> <p>I regret that the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 20112031 Part 1 – Transport Strategy was not more positive. That document identified ‘Haverhill to ... Cambridge bus connections’ as one of the key transport issues facing Suffolk in the future. That in itself is fine but some infrastructure improvements are also necessary, and here the document simply states that ‘infrastructure improvements may be limited at the start of this plan period’. The LTP does state on page 29, in connection with larger scale and longer term infrastructure projects that ‘this will require working with developers to secure funding.’</p> <p>This is an approach that I do not see at the forefront of thinking in the Haverhill Vision 2031.</p> <p>The Suffolk Local Transport Plan 20112031 Part 2 – Implementation Strategy refers, on page 7, to principal (A class) roads as ‘essential for safe movement around the county and to support the Suffolk economy.’</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>Just as improvements near Ipswich and doubling the rail track near Ely can increase considerably the volume of goods transported on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton railway line thus hopefully reducing the number of HGVs on the A14 in Suffolk and in Cambridgeshire, so improving the A1307 in Cambridgeshire can help support the Suffolk economy.</p> <p>Sometimes local boundaries just get in the way. In this case I believe authorities in Suffolk need to be more proactive in helping to secure development funding for improving the A1307. I do not see this in the Haverhill Vision 2031.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15971	Ms M F Henderson				Some stalwart names have disappeared from Haverhill Town Centre. Have you strategies to regenerate the high Street? There are now no direct links by public transport to London, Stansted or Ipswich. There is a need at present for provision of subsidised leisure activities for 13-18 year olds, who may well be responsible for much of the vandalism and anti-social behaviour, as there is a lack of affordable 'entertainment'. Not all will be interested in sport, not all in cinema or music.	Although some national names have been lost, they have tended to be victims of national impacts, not local. Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document. Improved transport links are a priority. Every effort is required to ensure that the needs of all sections of the community are provided for.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para 1.39 This refers to the 'need to protect Haverhill Country Walks and extend East Town Park'. The majority of the Haverhill Country Walks lies outside Haverhill and is within the Parishes of sturmer and Kedington. Any proposals to protect, enhance or develop these paths must be done with the full cooperation and involvement of the parishes concerned.</p> <p>Any proposals to extend the current boundaries of east Town Park further into the parish of sturmer would be strongly resisted by the current Parish Council.</p> <p>Chapter 2 Para 2.12 The statistics for out-commuting are incomplete as they do not account for the 30% who do not commute to Cambridge, Essex and Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>Para 2.14 There is a widely held perception that town centre shop closure has accelerated since September 2011. Any retail developments associated with the new housing to the north east and north west of Haverhill should not be detrimental to the objective of revitalising and regenerating the town centre.</p>	<p>All proposals which affect neighbouring parishes will be the subject of cooperation and involvement of the parishes affected. It is hoped that such consultation will be constructive. It is acknowledged that the out-commuting figures do not include all movements.</p> <p>Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para. 2.17 The problems outlined in this paragraph are obvious and experienced by many Haverhill commuters every working day. the proposed north east and north west developments will only exacerbate these problems. With anticipated links to Cambridge becoming stronger, a solution to this problem must be in place before the completion of the development.</p> <p>Chapter 5. Para. 5.9 Agree that any new communities are developed in such a way that they do not merge into nearby villages (including Sturmer).</p> <p>Para 5.21 Westfield School should not be demolished and redeveloped until it is certain that extra facilities will not be required by the increase in the number of pre-school children. It would make an ideal nursery/pre primary school and local community facility.</p> <p>Para. 5.26 From the perspective of Sturmer residents using the haverhill shopping facilities, a vibrant and attractive town centre is preferable to the development of small loacl shops which may struggle to survive in difficult economic times.</p>	The problems associated with journeys from the town is acknowledged. Not only will they have to be addressed before the completion of development, they will need to be continuously monitored and solutions updated as necessary. Westfield school has been the subject of a separate consultation associated with a Development Brief to seek potential alternative uses. Due to level changes within the building, it is not ideally suited to the uses suggested and no alternative user came forward.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para. 5.31 Schemes to bring back empty homes back onto the market would help reduce the need for new-build and are to be welcomed. help for the elderly to update, modernise or adapt older homes is essential. Incentives, advice and financial assistance for elderly and single people to downsize and potentially release larger family properties would also go some way towards reducing the need for additional building of housing stock.</p> <p>Para. 5.33 The retention of a school facility such as Chalkstone Middle may be necessary with the population increase which will eventually occur.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Aspiration 1. The Gibberd Master Plan for the redevelopment of Haverhill in the 1970s set out a network of footpaths and cycleways from the housing estates to the town centre. These must be re examined, updated and brought back into use. Where necessary they must be extended, re surfaced and attractively landscaped and publicised as a real alternative to using the car.</p>	<p>Although bringing back empty homes will assist in housing provision, there is not a large legacy of such homes. The design and condition of Chalkstone Middle School makes it unsuitable for re-use as a primary or secondary school. New school provision should be located where the the demand is located.</p> <p>Existing footpaths and cycleways should be utilised and improved, but where such provision does not exist, provision should be made.</p>	No changes required
					<p>Aspiration 3 Whilst the development of the Haverhill Northern Relief Road from the A143 to the A1307 Cambridge Road may be seen as necessary for preventing congestion in the Town it must not be seen as a precursor to a road linking the A143 to the A1017 in Sturmer at the Rowley Hill roundabout.</p>	<p>There is no aspiration to provide a relief road linking the A143 with Sturmer. The issue was considered and dismissed during the consideration of the Core Strategy in 2010.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 10 Aspiration 1</p> <p>The management of surface water runoff must not be seen just as a metter for Haverhill. we are clear that this must be a matter for the Environment Agency and anglian Water in consultation with all of those concerned. Any development which takes place in Haverhill MUST NOT exacerbate the current flooding problems experienced in Sturmer and downstream. We concur with the aspiration that the prioposed new development will provide the opportunity to ensure maximum runoff water capture for domestic use and the provision of numerous small scale flood relief ponds which can act as both landscape feature and wildlife habitat. Sturmer Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to become involved in the consultation and design process of these features.</p>	The concern relating to surface water run-off is acknowledged.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 14 Para.14.6 Relating to the proposed actions to achieve Aspiration1, the Stour Valley Footpath is already linked to the Railway Walk in East Town Park via the Railway Walk, Sturmer and Bridleway No. 17, Sturmer. The three paths also form part of the Haverhill Country Walks.</p> <p>As previously referred to in our response to Chapter 1 any extension of the east Town Park boundaries into Sturmer would be strongly opposed by the Parish Council.</p> <p>The suggestions for environmental improvement opportunities shown in GI Opportunity Map (page 66, Haverhill Vision 2031) significantly impinge of parishes outside the boundaries of Haverhill and must be the subject, with the parish, district and county authorities concerned, of local consultation and approval.</p>	These comments are noted as above.	No changes required
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 15 Para.15.3 The issue of pedestrianisation of the High Street must be resolved to the satisfaction of all, especially the elderly and those with mobility difficulties.</p>	This issue is a matter of ongoing discussion between all parties involved.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context: (Point 1) must include the words 'Calford Green' (Point 6) 2500 dwellings My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2.</p> <p>Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy SS3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwell's (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted.</p> <p>Ref. Development Principles (para 2) 'The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green 'this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW.</p> <p>(para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is (badly) maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p>	Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community – but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p> <p>Ref. Haverhill NorthEast Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners' opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>Part B</p>		
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Mitigating Circumstances for the non encroachment of Calford Green as evidenced by underpinning documentation This present round of consultation is near a midpoint in the overall process. It is not yet the final plan. However 'Haverhill 2031' is underpinned by earlier documents and in particular The Core Strategy (which went to public examination in 2010), and approved Dec 2010, (CS), The Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009, (GIS), by the Preferred Options Document presented January 2012, (POD), and The Development Management Submission Document – Policy EB4 (Protection of the Landscape) (DMSD)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Also, 'Haverhill 2031' will hopefully have been shaped by Inspector Mike Moore's report statement following the public examination in which he said ' In the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the masterplanning process' .(para 14.4) I responded to these documents and also spoke at the public hearing. My detailed written input with reference numbers will be held in your records. The scrapping of the Regional Spacial Strategy, and the new announcement in the March 2012 budget has not materially affected my earlier views, as summarised below. In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation.</p> <p>Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1) • A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes ... which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25) • It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11) • Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1SEBC09 fig 7.3) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic landscape character defined by ...small settlements and village greens...will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1SEBC09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington's only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor. • Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2. 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS –DISEBC – 09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g) • Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16013	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>Neither the maps nor their respective keys identify any Local Nature reserves (LNRs) which are present within the Borough. This is particularly relevant to Haverhill where the Railway Walks LNR passes through the centre of the town. All maps should be updated to include LNRs where relevant.</p>	<p>The revised document will include a monitoring and review framework.</p> <p>The document takes full account of the localism Act and is fully NPPF compliant, including the introduction of a specific policy required by the NPPF.</p> <p>All mapping will be updated as necessary.</p>	<p>Include a monitoring and review framework.</p> <p>Ensure the document is fully NPPF compliant.</p> <p>Update mapping as necessary.</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20999E	Chad				<p>the area where Iceland stood is possible for development.</p> <p>i don't like the idea of modern art work in a area of the town that has not been modernized.</p> <p>It would be nice to see the high street modernized, shop fronts ect.before the pedestrianization.give the town charm and character as looking down the high street looks like a patchwork quilt. all diffident eras and ad dons, modern next to old .i think the area where the church is should be in character also the centre of the town square and encourage functions there and give the place some atmosphere.</p> <p>also the paving in the town high street would not be nice if it was modern next to old looking shops.</p>	These comments are noted. Significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				It takes rather a long time to fill out on line as you have to keep referring to the document and if using a public computer as in the Library you are limited for time. Also the PDF is rather small on screens to read comfortably	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				The Planning Authority said a road going round North East Haverhill would stop people going to the town centre, cars should be encouraged not to go though the town centre, only to stop in the town centre. Why have the planning authority said yes to a road round the North West but not the North East?	There is no requirement to provide a relief road linking the A143 with Sturmer. The issue was considered and dismissed during the consideration of the Core Strategy in 2010.	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				Why do the input boxes have to be so small?	Thank you for your observation.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			I think that this is an exciting plan for the future of Haverhill. With town centre regeneration it could be a vibrant place. I appreciate the difficulty in attracting new retailers in to the town in a recession. One of Haverhills strengths is its individual family owned businesses which help to create a sense of community. Very hard to strike the balance.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				I BELIEVE THAT HAVERHILL SHOULD NOT OR BE ABLE TO GROW WITHOUT HARMING THE TOWN. WE HAVE DOCTORS SURGERIES CLOSING WHEN WE NEED MORE HEALTHCARE A TOWN FULL OF EMPTY SHOPS AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT WHY BUILD MORE HOUSES TO THE AMOUNT THAT WILL FLOOD OUR TOWN AND DO MORE DAMAGE I SAY NO MAYBE SMALL INCREASE IN HOUSING BY 1'000 BUT PEOPLE WHO ARE LOCAL ARE STILL NOT ABLE TO GET HOUSING SO THE MORE YOU BUILD THE MORE IT FILLS WITH PEOPLE FROM AFAR SO THE PROBLEMS WILL NOT BE SOLVED WITH LOCAL HOUSING.WE DONT WANT THE GOVERMENT TO USE OUR TOWN AND SUFFOLK ON THE WHOLE TO FLOOD IN MORE PEOPLE TO LIVE AND WORK TAKING THE LITTLE EMPLOYMENT WE HAVE IT WILL BE UNBALANCED AND WE CHOOSE TO LIVE HERE BECAUSE WE ARE SEMI RURAL AND WANT TO REMAIN THAT WAY.	It is not intended that growth should harm the town, but that growth should be supported by additional facilities such as improved healthcare. Although some national names have been lost from the High Street, they have tended to be victims of national impacts, not local. Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21676E	Jason				<p>Following the building on the Chalkstone playing fields there is more traffic by Mott's field now that the football pitches there are used more often. When the local dump is busy at the weekend the bottom part of Chalkstone way often becomes blocked. It will be even worse if the Snooker club is developed into houses as proposed. This road is currently causing problems even before more cars are sent along it. Please can you look into the trouble caused by parked cars along Mott's field.</p> <p>The new Westfield school is now open and the new development has not included a pathway across the top of the underpass bridge. I would guess that about 70% of Samuel Ward students walk along the road over this each day and now some primary kids will be doing the same but in the other direction. Is it wise to send even more traffic along this road? Surely commonsense should have been used and a path crated between the New Croft path and the Westfield school path.</p> <p>People views should be taken into consideration and not just recorded then ignored</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The issues raised need to be examined and resolved. Some relate to the Vision 2031 process, but others require immediate action.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context (Point 1) must include the words Calford Green (Point 6) 2500 dwellings - My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2. Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy S S3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwells (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted.</p> <p>Ref. Development Principles (para 2) The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW.</p>	Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>(para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p> <p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (Appx 3, para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area; it is recognised that wind turbines are not compatible with residential housing. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>Ref. Haverhill North-East Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation. Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p> <p>There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1)</p> <p>A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11)</p> <p>Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1-SEBC-09 fig 7.3)</p> <p>The historic landscape character defined by small settlements and village greens will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1-SEBC-09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS SEBC09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now - and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g)</p> <p>Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57)</p>		
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			Recommend consultation with health on developments/proposals to determine whether a health impact assessment is required in order to mitigate harmful effects and enhance positive effects on human health and wellbeing.	Thank you for your observation	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				All the above. Less new housing. More jobs. Better regeneration of existing settlement. Better road network for the 97% of population who need it.	With the exception of the housing figures which have already been agreed as part of the Core Strategy, these suggestions accord with the aims of the document. It is not clear whether the road network improvement comment relates solely to car drivers, or all users of the roads, including pedestrians, cyclists, buses and commercial vehicles.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context: (Point 1) must include the words 'Calford Green' (Point 6) 2500 dwellings My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2.</p> <p>Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy SS3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwell's (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted.</p> <p>Ref. Development Principles (para 2) 'The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green 'this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW.</p> <p>(para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is (badly) maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p>	Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community – but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p> <p>Ref. Haverhill NorthEast Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners' opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>Part B</p>		
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Mitigating Circumstances for the non encroachment of Calford Green as evidenced by underpinning documentation This present round of consultation is near a midpoint in the overall process. It is not yet the final plan. However 'Haverhill 2031' is underpinned by earlier documents and in particular The Core Strategy (which went to public examination in 2010), and approved Dec 2010, (CS), The Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009, (GIS), by the Preferred Options Document presented January 2012, (POD), and The Development Management Submission Document – Policy EB4 (Protection of the Landscape) (DMSD)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Also, 'Haverhill 2031' will hopefully have been shaped by Inspector Mike Moore's report statement following the public examination in which he said ' In the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the masterplanning process' .(para 14.4) I responded to these documents and also spoke at the public hearing. My detailed written input with reference numbers will be held in your records. The scrapping of the Regional Spacial Strategy, and the new announcement in the March 2012 budget has not materially affected my earlier views, as summarised below. In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation.</p> <p>Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1) • A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes ... which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25) • It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11) • Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1SEBC09 fig 7.3) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic landscape character defined by ...small settlements and village greens...will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1SEBC09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington's only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor. • Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2. 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS –DISEBC – 09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g) • Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15668	Matthew Hancock MP				As you know I support your goals in setting out a long term vision, and strongly support the very wide amount of consultation you are going through. It is very important people feel they are having a say in the process, and you have been very open in encouraging that. I also agree with your broad strategy for development: incremental growth in villages, in keeping with local heritage and mindful of local amenities, and strong growth of both housing and commercial allocations in Haverhill, which is a growing, increasingly vibrant, up and coming town.	Your support is welcomed	No changes required
HVR15703	Mr G J Winchester				I would like to make a couple of points whilst this work is ongoing: 1. The road kept clean and free of mud 2. Proper safe access for ambulance etc to the sixty dwellings often needed 3. The boundary wall to stop children sitting on it. I can assure you I look forward to the dwellings. I also hope one of your reps will supervise the project.	Not sure which site this relates to, however, the general principles would apply to all sites.	No changes required
HVR15705	Mr & Mrs M Roake				Please find enclosed local objection to the development of the land on the corner of Millfields Way and Kestrel Road (HV4b). The development of this site will also affect a much wider range of surrounding residents.	This site already benefits from planning permission for development, although it is as yet unimplemented.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15721	David Hussell				<p>Churches Together has no objections or adverse comments to make and in fact welcomes the initiative of the Borough Council to create long term and effective plans to guide the continuing prosperity, growth and success, in all the important ways, for these two towns.</p> <p>For Haverhill, and in particular the larger proposed expansion to the north east of the town, we have, through the agents Bidwells, started active discussions with the landowner Mrs Pelly as well as initiating dialogue with the local clergy, with the view to identifying the religious accommodation needs of future inhabitants. It is likely that some form of new local church accommodation will be required within the north east expansion.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15727	Barbara Richardson				<p>I writing regarding the letter we received about Wisdom Factory Site.</p> <p>As we live at the bottom of Colne Valley Road we are concerned about these proposals. Surly parts of the building, i.e. the offices are under the conservation rule the same as our house which faces Hamlet Road and the side Colne Valle Road, or are these rules relaxed to suit?</p> <p>Are you able to advise how many houses will be built and also the access routes? There have been enough opposition about the proposed houses and the old Hamlet Croft Football grounds due to the amount of traffic that will be coming out to Hamlet Road, and now with this proposal it will be even worse!!</p> <p>I would strongly oppose if the access route comes down the bottom of Colne Valley Road, especial when there is LAMPH which is a playgroup and of course the Scouts but also due to the build up of traffic.</p>	<p>Before any development is proposed for this site, all the concerns raised will need to be addressed. The existing Victorian office building is particular importance to the character of the area, but not the general industrial buildings. At present the site takes all access from Colne Valley Road, but potential exists for access to Duddery Hill. All options will need to be explored. The nature and scale of development will be the subject of further work and consultation.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15731	Peter Thomas				I'm very concerned about the areas that may be affected, we live in kirtling place, just off Chalkstone way. We moved up here 7 years ago from London to live by the countryside. Since we've we've been here houses have been built on what was good habitat for wildlife, then a football stadium was built though that hasn't been a problem really but now we have that awful looking new school being built on a third of what was a much nicer looking wheat field. Looking at the vision plans it looks to me like the rest of that field and beyond is being looked at to be turned into more bricks and mortar.	Development of any kind is likely to have an impact upon wildlife, but it need not be negative. It is acknowledged that some species do not tolerate human habitation, but many thrive, particularly where the correct habitat is created. This is acknowledged by the revised Concept Statement for development of the strategic growth area, which seeks to improve biodiversity through the creation of inter-connected habitats and open space.	No changes required
	Peter Thomas				Can you confirm if I'm looking at the plans correctly ? If so then I think my days in Haverhill will be numbered, I'm really sick and tired of our lovely countryside being turned into bricks and mortar, not only does it destroy lovely views,walks,fresh air etc etc but has anybody any idea or care what it does to our ever decreasing wildlife? There wont be any wildlife or countryside in time if we keep building,building building, nice villages being turned into towns (like Haverhill) and then the towns being turned into bigger towns with over population and crime problems with less police to deal with them. A vision this may be but will only ruin the town in the long run and its surrounding countryside.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15732	Mr & Mrs Burnett				<p>If it is deemed necessary to provide in excess of 2,500 dwellings in or around Haverhill then there is an adequate amount of space on the entrance to Haverhill (to the right of the 1st roundabout). This is supported by a main road and would provide easy access in & out of Haverhill without disruption to the town and current occupants.</p> <p>We hope that you do take into consideration the thoughts & feelings of existing residents.</p>	The principal access to the strategic growth area will be to the A143. However, the area will require more than one point of access and a key objective is to integrate development. The development will also create community facilities which should be accessible to existing residents.	No changes required
HVR15838	K Ian Johnson supported by a petition of 350 names				This response is supported by a petition containing 350 signatures.		
HVR15872	Mrs A Wilson				<p>It was very difficult to read the document online. I didn't like the way the 'aspirations' were laid out next to the questions. It was very confusing and I am used to computers. Couldn't read the detailed maps. Having columns meant you had to keep scrolling up and down to read the text instead of the more natural left to right approach.</p> <p>It took one and a half hours to complete scanning the document.</p>	The next version of the document will not include the questions. These concerns will be considered in the design of the next version, but it may still require columns.	Consider these observations in the design of the next version of the document.
HVR15874	Mr R J Bayles				Re above question - see my reply to question 6	This has been addressed in response to question 6.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15876	Mrs Marty House				Coupals Road would need to be staightened and widened to accommodate additional traffic. Local residents think more parkland is needed.	This issue is addressed in the revised Concept Statement, which moves the access to Coupals road westward and increases the open space between Haverhill and Calford Green. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required
HVR15884	Mr R Maidment			Haverhill Chamber of Commerce	<p>As the Committee Member responsible for local planning, the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce have asked me to convey their views on 'Haverhill Vision 2031'. They are of the opinion that the overall thrust is generally fair and balanced but, from a commercial viewpoint and at the early stage of the appraisal, it is difficult for the group to make any specific observations. There is, however, the obvious ongoing need for improvement to basic infrastructure and in particular the strategic internal and external road links to and from the town and the town centre.</p> <p>The Chamber hopes this simple observation is of some help and look forward to being more actively involved as the plans progress.</p>	Thank you for your support and observations.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15887	Mick Smith	HAVO			<p>I am Mick Smith and I chair the Haverhill Association of Voluntary Organisations or HAVO. I and my colleague, Michael Simpkin attended your initial consultation at Samuel Wards Upper School a while ago where we made very clear what we in Haverhill wanted with regard to housing development. From what I have seen of the proposed development I wonder why we bothered really even though I understand that a consultation is not in any way a negotiation.</p> <p>Now both my colleague, Michael Simpkin and myself wanted to attend the consultation - that I understand was for invitees only - but we were sent our invite much too late and had other prior engagements to attend on both evenings.</p> <p>Below I have set down some of the things that we both feel very strongly would actually benefit our town and its citizens:</p>	<p>These observations do not explain in what way the views of consultees have been ignored. However, it is acknowledged that some key issues relating to the shape of the strategic growth area expressed at the developer workshops were not incorporated on the concept statement in Chapter 16. These have now been addressed in the revised concept statement.</p>	<p>No further changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mick Smith	HAVO			We both feel strongly that the town ought to expand considerably so as to be large enough to justify all the things we in this town - and those before us too - have been banging on about for years now: Better healthcare facilities like the 'Darzi' centre promised to provide like X Ray facility, a minor surgery unit, consultant rooms, all the things that would have reduced A&E attendances at both the West Suffolk and Addenbrookes hospitals; the provision of a rail connection to Cambridge and Stansted; a much, much larger shopping offer in a very much expanded shopping centre; proper parkland facilities and a good direct connection between the two town parks 'East and West' (my suggestion would be a railway operating just like the Romney Hythe & Dymchurch Railway down in Kent) and the luring of High St names like M&S to our town too.	It is hoped that improved healthcare facilities can be achieved. Clearly the Darzi clinic has now closed, but alternatives are discussed in Chapter 12. This will require ongoing work with the healthcare providers.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mick Smith	HAVO			<p>As for housing development we both agree that a development like the Morton Hall development in Bury St Eds is much needed here in Haverhill and not too distant from our town centre either. The relief road system ought now to be finally dealt with to connect what started out as a relief road and needs now to be completed then another relief road to connect the A143 to the Sturmer Road (A 1017?) so as to relieve our town centre from through traffic that does more harm than good in clogging up our town centre traffic.</p> <p>The agreed principle your officers took away with you from that previous consultation was a connecting road from the east town development to the Sturmer road roundabout and the proper connection of the open land to East Town Park so as to provide a beautiful corridor of nature and walks and so forth that would be a beneficial legacy for many years to come. This was ignored and what we have been left with is a pathetic excuse for a bit of a park!</p>	The issue of a further relief road to connect the A143 with Sturmer was considered and dismissed during examination of the Core Strategy in 2010. The corridor of open land remains, but does not require a road.	No changes required
	Mick Smith	HAVO			I doubt very much whether you will take any notice of this but I have at least benefited by having the right - and exercising that right - to take part in this consultation.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15894	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			Terminology needs to be changed to include 'hamlets' where they are included in a Parish, for example, Calford Green is a hamlet included in the Parish of Kedington (village). Calford Green needs much consideration in respect of the plans for North East Haverhill, as already pointed out by Inspector Moore's statement, 'in the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone, but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the master-planning process'.. It is imperative that small hamlets, like Calford Green and villages like Kedington, are protected and not swallowed up in large scale developments. The Haverhill Vision 2031 should not confine development to North East Haverhill when there are other opportunities for development on land nearer to the Cambridge side of Haverhill.	Throughout the document and within the revised concept statement reference is made to the importance of the setting and separation of Calford Green. Reference to it as a hamlet within the parish of Kedington would not change its status or consideration. The principle of bringing the north east area forward to meet the strategic growth needs of Haverhill for the next 20 years was established by the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy which was adopted on 2010 following an examination in public by an independent Inspector. Alternative sites were considered at that time.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>The development of North East Haverhill would not meet the requirements for walking distances to town centres. There are only two fields between Calford Green and Haverhill at present and a buffer zone between the proposed development and Calford Green should not effectively be an smaller than this and the proposed housing line will be required to be moved back to achieve this.</p> <p>Kedington Parish Council does not appear on the published list of consultees for the Haverhill Action Plan, yet organisations as far as Cambridgeshire and Essex are. Since the proposed development for North East Haverhill spills onto land which is in the Parish of Kedington, this would have been appropriate. Presumably it was the consultees who were invited to the original feedback session (1.42) that was held at the end of the assessment of the output from the Princes Foundation Trust Community Capital Framework, which then were used to inform the objectives and visions of both the Haverhill and Rural Visions 2031.</p>	The walking distances referred to relate to walkable neighbourhoods, not distance from the town centre. The location of the furthest part of the proposed NE Haverhill Strategic Growth Area is closer to the town centre than some existing residential neighbourhoods on the western side of the town.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>Who was in this group and why does this supersede local views? Why was this new tool introduced and used to override the consultation feedback from the official consultation with the people of Haverhill that ended on 1st April?</p> <p>Action Plan needs to be based on more than a 'hunch' if it is to be used to justify 5000 new homes, many to be built on greenfield land outside the development boundary and in a town without jobs to support them. Action Plan should be more about regeneration of the town, than of extending it. There is little evidence of the need for housing in Haverhill to support jobs there; the jobs/housing imbalance is excessive and there clearly needs to be efforts to address this before further population expansion. The significant and rapid over supply of housing with the significant under supply of jobs and continued decline in the manufacturing sector has forced people in Haverhill and wider area to travel further to work.</p>	<p>The Prince's Trust work involved local people and forms just one element of the consultation and does not over ride any other consultation feedback.</p> <p>The Haverhill Vision 2031 is a comprehensive document which addresses wide range of issues for Haverhill over the next 20 years, not just housing growth. Regeneration of areas is potentially an ongoing process, but this will not address provision of jobs, homes and services for the growing population. Haverhill 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. This includes broadening the range of employment opportunities, encouraging retail, service and research sectors in addition to the traditional employment sectors.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>This has caused significant inequality in the job market for all who are deprived and not able to operate their own car. The development in North East Haverhill conflicts with National Policy Guidance on Transport because it does not reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>During the environmental impact assessment of the Core Strategy, the transport assessment only looked at distances travelled by St Edmundsbury occupants to work where their destinations of travel fell within the Borough of St Edmundsbury. This is a significant failure; some of the statistics given, which are well out of date also seem dubious. The joint development DMP Sustainability Appraisal states 'available data suggests that the distance that residents commute to work is significantly higher than the national mean'.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment looked at where residents of Haverhill travelled to work. Given that this plan is for Haverhill, it is a reasonable approach to take. Planning cannot control where people work, it can only influence travel patterns by creating a better balance of homes, jobs and services.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>Haverhill Action Plan should address this by commissioning an up to date transport assessment to determine the workplace destinations of the working population to evaluate the likely detrimental environment impact caused by significant levels of additional out commuters from housing in Haverhill. The St Edmundsbury LDF Haverhill Transport Impacts Assessment is based on out of date statistics from 2001 and it can now be seen how the working patterns of the local economy can change in 10 years. This then needs to be reviewed by the same Planning Inspector who evaluated the Core Strategy and cross checked for soundness.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			<p>There has been a lot said about the proximity to Cambridge. The Cambridge Sub Region Study or the Buchanan Report was a major study which looked at the capacity and impacts of development options and was used by St Edmundsbury Borough Council during previous Haverhill Vision exercises in terms of sustainability criteria and implementation. Although the regional spatial strategies may have now been dropped, the underlying sustainability research and recommendations should still be valid. The Buchanan report recommended that in order to maintain its rural integrity, settlements (villages and hamlets) should have a clear separation distance from an encroaching town. In order to protect the hamlet of Calford Green from coalescence, a landscape character assessment should be made of the area between the existing settlement boundary of Haverhill and the settlement of Calford Green, which can then be used to ensure it maintains its distinctive identity.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			It has been noticed there are plans to remove the Urban Edge because apparently there is no policy for this. However, there is a planning policy and guidance for development - it is called a settlement boundary. An Area Action Plan should plan for development within that area. The Core Strategy misled people because it was not made clear at the time, that the proposed development of North East Haverhill would be so far outside the development boundary and much further than the Parish of Kedington were led to believe. Maps have failed to show the existing settlement boundary so people's comments would have been shaped on the basis that this land was within Haverhill.	The process of preparing LDF documents and in particular, a Core Strategy did not permit definition of sites. Such sites would be defined by a more in depth process of producing Area Action Plans, which is what has been achieved through the Haverhill Vision 2031 document.	No changes required
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			No information on the exact location of development was available at the time of the Core Strategy consultation, despite references that were made to an attached Plan which was missing. Leaving this ambiguity until the Haverhill Action plan at which point commitments appear to have already been made is inadequate if this is a key objective. For a key objective to be so, it must be clear and obvious. The Haverhill Action Plan should ensure that through design, the housing identified can be fitted within the land available inside the settlement boundary.		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15896	Emma Goodings	Braintree District Council			<p>Notwithstanding our concerns set out in our response to question 6 of this questionnaire regarding the extent of the boundary of the site, Braintree District Council is satisfied that at this stage the eastern end of the site, where it abuts Braintree District and the countryside, includes a large area of strategic open space, to reflect the rural character of the areas surrounding the development site. However we would suggest that this open space be continued to the west as there is no urban development on the other side of the proposed development boundary and this will leave an isolated finger of urban development out of character with the countryside which it is surrounded by.</p> <p>We remain concerned about the Coupals Road access point and how far the design of that access point will go to prevent additional traffic using the new road and the roads surrounding it, including those in Sturmer Parish, as a rat run to bypass central Haverhill.</p> <p>We would reiterate our wish to be consulted upon any further progress in the masterplan for this site.</p>	Thank you for your observations. The concept statement for the strategic growth has been amended to take account of your concerns. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15905	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>I do not propose to comment on much of the detail contained within the Haverhill Vision 2031 document as this is rightly the concerns of local residents. However, I do wish to comment on the impact further development in Haverhill will have on the A1307.</p> <p>The introduction to section 2, on page 13, refers to 'strong economic links to Cambridge and a large proportion of residents commute to work in Cambridgeshire'. Paragraph 2.12 refers to 'the high level of out commuting' and that 'it is thought one of the key workplaces attracting Haverhill people is Addenbrookes Hospital'.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.17 goes on to state that 'the A1307 towards Cambridge ... has a poor accident record and is severely congested in places, especially at Linton.'</p> <p>Section 3 considers Haverhill in 2031. Part of paragraph 3.1 states that 'To achieve people's aspirations, in 2031 Haverhill will be a town that has ... 'a diverse employment base with strong links to Cambridge'. As set out in the Core Strategy, Haverhill is likely to have at least 4,260 new homes between 2009 and 2031.</p>	Thank you for your observations and comments. It is acknowledged that a bus caught in congestion has no advantage over a car caught in congestion and that some infrastructure work will be required. This needs to be explored further by the ongoing collaborative work of all of the authorities involved and the support of Cambridgeshire County Council is greatly appreciated.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>The key issue relating to my response is raised in paragraph 6.3: 'Businesses are concerned about congestion on the A1307 which links Haverhill to Cambridge. Agents ... identify poor access as a reason why Cambridge businesses do not move to Haverhill.</p> <p>The document does refer to proposed actions to address issues relating to jobs and employment, for example, paragraph 6.4b 'lobby for improvement of transport links with Cambridge'. I agree that councils, within and outside Suffolk, must work together to lobby for improved transport links, but councils need to be more proactive.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.43 concerns the Princes Foundation Vision Statements, of which c) states 'Haverhill will be connected to ... Addenbrookes and Cambridge ... by high speed dedicated bus services.'</p> <p>I support this vision but high speed buses will not be quick if they are held up by congestion.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	Abingtons Ward			<p>In my view, the Haverhill Vision 2031 document needs to address congestion issues on the A1307 in a manner that is more likely to be successful. To this end the document should include more about how developments in Haverhill need to directly contribute towards the additional congestion that they will cause. Otherwise, the words of paragraph 6.3 will become even more true businesses will not relocate to Haverhill because of congestion on the A1307, so that local growth will eventually strangle itself.</p> <p>I welcome the increased level of collaboration between Suffolk County Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to tackle the issues of safety and congestion on the A1307. My concern is that the Haverhill Vision 2031 is not sufficiently proactive in addressing these issues. Yes concerted lobbying by the councils is important but councils through local developments also have a direct role to play.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>Developments, whether of houses or employment or both have consequences, and we cannot simply hope that government will solve all our problems. I regret that the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 20112031 Part 1 – Transport Strategy was not more positive. That document identified ‘Haverhill to ... Cambridge bus connections’ as one of the key transport issues facing Suffolk in the future. That in itself is fine but some infrastructure improvements are also necessary, and here the document simply states that ‘infrastructure improvements may be limited at the start of this plan period’. The LTP does state on page 29, in connection with larger scale and longer term infrastructure projects that ‘this will require working with developers to secure funding.’</p> <p>This is an approach that I do not see at the forefront of thinking in the Haverhill Vision 2031.</p> <p>The Suffolk Local Transport Plan 20112031 Part 2 – Implementation Strategy refers, on page 7, to principal (A class) roads as ‘essential for safe movement around the county and to support the Suffolk economy.’</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tony Orgee	District and County Councillor Abingtons Ward			<p>Just as improvements near Ipswich and doubling the rail track near Ely can increase considerably the volume of goods transported on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton railway line thus hopefully reducing the number of HGVs on the A14 in Suffolk and in Cambridgeshire, so improving the A1307 in Cambridgeshire can help support the Suffolk economy.</p> <p>Sometimes local boundaries just get in the way. In this case I believe authorities in Suffolk need to be more proactive in helping to secure development funding for improving the A1307. I do not see this in the Haverhill Vision 2031.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15971	Ms M F Henderson				Some stalwart names have disappeared from Haverhill Town Centre. Have you strategies to regenerate the high Street? There are now no direct links by public transport to London, Stansted or Ipswich. There is a need at present for provision of subsidised leisure activities for 13-18 year olds, who may well be responsible for much of the vandalism and anti-social behaviour, as there is a lack of affordable 'entertainment'. Not all will be interested in sport, not all in cinema or music.	Although some national names have been lost, they have tended to be victims of national impacts, not local. Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document. Improved transport links are a priority. Every effort is required to ensure that the needs of all sections of the community are provided for.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15975	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para 1.39 This refers to the 'need to protect Haverhill Country Walks and extend East Town Park'. The majority of the Haverhill Country Walks lies outside Haverhill and is within the Parishes of sturmer and Kedington. Any proposals to protect, enhance or develop these paths must be done with the full cooperation and involvement of the parishes concerned.</p> <p>Any proposals to extend the current boundaries of east Town Park further into the parish of sturmer would be strongly resisted by the current Parish Council.</p> <p>Chapter 2 Para 2.12 The statistics for out-commuting are incomplete as they do not account for the 30% who do not commute to Cambridge, Essex and Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>Para 2.14 There is a widely held perception that town centre shop closure has accelerated since September 2011. Any retail developments associated with the new housing to the north east and north west of Haverhill should not be detrimental to the objective of revitalising and regenerating the town centre.</p>	<p>All proposals which affect neighbouring parishes will be the subject of cooperation and involvement of the parishes affected. It is hoped that such consultation will be constructive. It is acknowledged that the out-commuting figures do not include all movements.</p> <p>Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para. 2.17 The problems outlined in this paragraph are obvious and experienced by many Haverhill commuters every working day. the proposed north east and north west developments will only exacerbate these problems. With anticipated links to Cambridge becoming stronger, a solution to this problem must be in place before the completion of the development.</p> <p>Chapter 5. Para. 5.9 Agree that any new communities are developed in such a way that they do not merge into nearby villages (including Sturmer).</p> <p>Para 5.21 Westfield School should not be demolished and redeveloped until it is certain that extra facilities will not be required by the increase in the number of pre-school children. It would make an ideal nursery/pre primary school and local community facility.</p> <p>Para. 5.26 From the perspective of Sturmer residents using the haverhill shopping facilities, a vibrant and attractive town centre is preferable to the development of small loacl shops which may struggle to survive in difficult economic times.</p>	The problems associated with journeys from the town is acknowledged. Not only will they have to be addressed before the completion of development, they will need to be continuously monitored and solutions updated as necessary. Westfield school has been the subject of a separate consultation associated with a Development Brief to seek potential alternative uses. Due to level changes within the building, it is not ideally suited to the uses suggested and no alternative user came forward.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Para. 5.31 Schemes to bring back empty homes back onto the market would help reduce the need for new-build and are to be welcomed. help for the elderly to update, modernise or adapt older homes is essential. Incentives, advice and financial assistance for elderly and single people to downsize and potentially release larger family properties would also go some way towards reducing the need for additional building of housing stock.</p> <p>Para. 5.33 The retention of a school facility such as Chalkstone Middle may be necessary with the population increase which will eventually occur.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Aspiration 1. The Gibberd Master Plan for the redevelopment of Haverhill in the 1970s set out a network of footpaths and cycleways from the housing estates to the town centre. These must be re examined, updated and brought back into use. Where necessary they must be extended, re surfaced and attractively landscaped and publicised as a real alternative to using the car.</p>	<p>Although bringing back empty homes will assist in housing provision, there is not a large legacy of such homes. The design and condition of Chalkstone Middle School makes it unsuitable for re-use as a primary or secondary school. New school provision should be located where the the demand is located.</p> <p>Existing footpaths and cycleways should be utilised and improved, but where such provision does not exist, provision should be made.</p>	No changes required
					<p>Aspiration 3 Whilst the development of the Haverhill Northern Relief Road from the A143 to the A1307 Cambridge Road may be seen as necessary for preventing congestion in the Town it must not be seen as a precursor to a road linking the A143 to the A1017 in Sturmer at the Rowley Hill roundabout.</p>	<p>There is no aspiration to provide a relief road linking the A143 with Sturmer. The issue was considered and dismissed during the consideration of the Core Strategy in 2010.</p>	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 10 Aspiration 1</p> <p>The management of surface water runoff must not be seen just as a metter for Haverhill. we are clear that this must be a matter for the Environment Agency and anglian Water in consultation with all of those concerned. Any development which takes place in Haverhill MUST NOT exacerbate the current flooding problems experienced in Sturmer and downstream. We concur with the aspiration that the prioposed new development will provide the opportunity to ensure maximum runoff water capture for domestic use and the provision of numerous small scale flood relief ponds which can act as both landscape feature and wildlife habitat. Sturmer Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to become involved in the consultation and design process of these features.</p>	The concern relating to surface water run-off is acknowledged.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 14 Para.14.6 Relating to the proposed actions to achieve Aspiration1, the Stour Valley Footpath is already linked to the Railway Walk in East Town Park via the Railway Walk, Sturmer and Bridleway No. 17, Sturmer. The three paths also form part of the Haverhill Country Walks.</p> <p>As previously referred to in our response to Chapter 1 any extension of the east Town Park boundaries into Sturmer would be strongly opposed by the Parish Council.</p> <p>The suggestions for environmental improvement opportunities shown in GI Opportunity Map (page 66, Haverhill Vision 2031) significantly impinge of parishes outside the boundaries of Haverhill and must be the subject, with the parish, district and county authorities concerned, of local consultation and approval.</p>	These comments are noted as above.	No changes required
	David Porth	Sturmer Parish Council			<p>Chapter 15 Para.15.3 The issue of pedestrianisation of the High Street must be resolved to the satisfaction of all, especially the elderly and those with mobility difficulties.</p>	This issue is a matter of ongoing discussion between all parties involved.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15985	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context: (Point 1) must include the words 'Calford Green' (Point 6) 2500 dwellings My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2.</p> <p>Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy SS3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwell's (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted.</p> <p>Ref. Development Principles (para 2) 'The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green 'this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW.</p> <p>(para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is (badly) maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p>	Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community – but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p> <p>Ref. Haverhill NorthEast Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners' opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>Part B</p>		
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Mitigating Circumstances for the non encroachment of Calford Green as evidenced by underpinning documentation This present round of consultation is near a midpoint in the overall process. It is not yet the final plan. However 'Haverhill 2031' is underpinned by earlier documents and in particular The Core Strategy (which went to public examination in 2010), and approved Dec 2010, (CS), The Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009, (GIS), by the Preferred Options Document presented January 2012, (POD), and The Development Management Submission Document – Policy EB4 (Protection of the Landscape) (DMSD)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<p>Also, 'Haverhill 2031' will hopefully have been shaped by Inspector Mike Moore's report statement following the public examination in which he said ' In the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the masterplanning process' .(para 14.4) I responded to these documents and also spoke at the public hearing. My detailed written input with reference numbers will be held in your records. The scrapping of the Regional Spacial Strategy, and the new announcement in the March 2012 budget has not materially affected my earlier views, as summarised below. In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation.</p> <p>Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1) • A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes ... which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25) • It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11) • Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1SEBC09 fig 7.3) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic landscape character defined by ...small settlements and village greens...will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1SEBC09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington's only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor. • Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2. 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian Evans	Representing 14 residents			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS –DISEBC – 09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g) • Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR16013	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>Neither the maps nor their respective keys identify any Local Nature reserves (LNRs) which are present within the Borough. This is particularly relevant to Haverhill where the Railway Walks LNR passes through the centre of the town. All maps should be updated to include LNRs where relevant.</p>	<p>The revised document will include a monitoring and review framework.</p> <p>The document takes full account of the localism Act and is fully NPPF compliant, including the introduction of a specific policy required by the NPPF.</p> <p>All mapping will be updated as necessary.</p>	<p>Include a monitoring and review framework.</p> <p>Ensure the document is fully NPPF compliant.</p> <p>Update mapping as necessary.</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR20999E	Chad				<p>the area where Iceland stood is possible for development.</p> <p>i don't like the idea of modern art work in a area of the town that has not been modernized.</p> <p>It would be nice to see the high street modernized, shop fronts ect.before the pedestrianization.give the town charm and character as looking down the high street looks like a patchwork quilt. all diffident eras and ad dons, modern next to old .i think the area where the church is should be in character also the centre of the town square and encourage functions there and give the place some atmosphere.</p> <p>also the paving in the town high street would not be nice if it was modern next to old looking shops.</p>	These comments are noted. Significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.	No changes required
HVR21270E	Mrs Woodley				It takes rather a long time to fill out on line as you have to keep referring to the document and if using a public computer as in the Library you are limited for time. Also the PDF is rather small on screens to read comfortably	Thank you for your comments.	No changes required
HVR21303E	Patrick Hanlon				The Planning Authority said a road going round North East Haverhill would stop people going to the town centre, cars should be encouraged not to go though the town centre, only to stop in the town centre. Why have the planning authority said yes to a road round the North West but not the North East?	There is no requirement to provide a relief road linking the A143 with Sturmer. The issue was considered and dismissed during the consideration of the Core Strategy in 2010.	No changes required
HVR21401E	John Burns				Why do the input boxes have to be so small?	Thank you for your observation.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21548E	Sian Gilligan	Withersfield Parish Councillor			I think that this is an exciting plan for the future of Haverhill. With town centre regeneration it could be a vibrant place. I appreciate the difficulty in attracting new retailers in to the town in a recession. One of Haverhills strengths is its individual family owned businesses which help to create a sense of community. Very hard to strike the balance.	Thank you for your support.	No changes required
HVR21551E	Mrs C Abbott				I BELIEVE THAT HAVERHILL SHOULD NOT OR BE ABLE TO GROW WITHOUT HARMING THE TOWN. WE HAVE DOCTORS SURGERIES CLOSING WHEN WE NEED MORE HEALTHCARE A TOWN FULL OF EMPTY SHOPS AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT WHY BUILD MORE HOUSES TO THE AMOUNT THAT WILL FLOOD OUR TOWN AND DO MORE DAMAGE I SAY NO MAYBE SMALL INCREASE IN HOUSING BY 1'000 BUT PEOPLE WHO ARE LOCAL ARE STILL NOT ABLE TO GET HOUSING SO THE MORE YOU BUILD THE MORE IT FILLS WITH PEOPLE FROM AFAR SO THE PROBLEMS WILL NOT BE SOLVED WITH LOCAL HOUSING.WE DONT WANT THE GOVERMENT TO USE OUR TOWN AND SUFFOLK ON THE WHOLE TO FLOOD IN MORE PEOPLE TO LIVE AND WORK TAKING THE LITTLE EMPLOYMENT WE HAVE IT WILL BE UNBALANCED AND WE CHOOSE TO LIVE HERE BECAUSE WE ARE SEMI RURAL AND WANT TO REMAIN THAT WAY.	It is not intended that growth should harm the town, but that growth should be supported by additional facilities such as improved healthcare. Although some national names have been lost from the High Street, they have tended to be victims of national impacts, not local. Vacancy rates in the town centre are below national and local averages. However, significant work is required to make Haverhill town centre a more attractive place for residents. This is being addressed through the requirement for a town centre masterplan. This is too large an issue to be addressed by this document.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21676E	Jason				<p>Following the building on the Chalkstone playing fields there is more traffic by Mott's field now that the football pitches there are used more often. When the local dump is busy at the weekend the bottom part of Chalkstone way often becomes blocked. It will be even worse if the Snooker club is developed into houses as proposed. This road is currently causing problems even before more cars are sent along it. Please can you look into the trouble caused by parked cars along Mott's field.</p> <p>The new Westfield school is now open and the new development has not included a pathway across the top of the underpass bridge. I would guess that about 70% of Samuel Ward students walk along the road over this each day and now some primary kids will be doing the same but in the other direction. Is it wise to send even more traffic along this road? Surely commonsense should have been used and a path crated between the New Croft path and the Westfield school path.</p> <p>People views should be taken into consideration and not just recorded then ignored</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The issues raised need to be examined and resolved. Some relate to the Vision 2031 process, but others require immediate action.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21685E	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context (Point 1) must include the words Calford Green (Point 6) 2500 dwellings - My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2. Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy S S3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwells (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted.</p> <p>Ref. Development Principles (para 2) The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW.</p>	Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.	No further changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>(para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p> <p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (Appx 3, para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area; it is recognised that wind turbines are not compatible with residential housing. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>Ref. Haverhill North-East Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation. Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p> <p>There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1)</p> <p>A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11)</p> <p>Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1-SEBC-09 fig 7.3)</p> <p>The historic landscape character defined by small settlements and village greens will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1-SEBC-09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2.</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gwyn & Sue Davies-Scourfield				<p>A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS SEBC09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now - and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g)</p> <p>Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57)</p>		
HVR21754E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			Recommend consultation with health on developments/proposals to determine whether a health impact assessment is required in order to mitigate harmful effects and enhance positive effects on human health and wellbeing.	Thank you for your observation	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR21758E	Nathan Loader				All the above. Less new housing. More jobs. Better regeneration of existing settlement. Better road network for the 97% of population who need it.	With the exception of the housing figures which have already been agreed as part of the Core Strategy, these suggestions accord with the aims of the document. It is not clear whether the road network improvement comment relates solely to car drivers, or all users of the roads, including pedestrians, cyclists, buses and commercial vehicles.	No changes required

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
HVR15729	Barbara Surridge				<p>Appendix 3 Ref. Policy Context: (Point 1) must include the words 'Calford Green' (Point 6) 2500 dwellings My opinion: too many for this area if the plan is to be compliant with underlying governing statements as listed in Part 2. Ian Poole stated after the abolition of the regional special strategy that the framework plan was still appropriate. This states that Bury (Policy SS3) is to be a key centre of development and change, and to have the majority of the new development. Bidwell's (Marcia Whitehead) challenged the validity of the settlement hierarchy at the Examination stating the Haverhill was on a par with Bury, but this view was not accepted. Ref. Development Principles (para 2) 'The development will maintain the separation of Calford Green 'this will not happen if the proposed housing line is not moved back further to the NW. (para 8) The bends in the proposed road to Coupals Road are unlikely to deter a rat run. The entry of a road onto Coupals Road would create further hazards on a road that at present is (badly) maintained by both Suffolk and Essex.</p>	<p>Appendix 3 has been deleted in its entirety and a new Concept Statement produced taking account of all the comments which were submitted. This includes moving the boundary further from Calford Green and providing strategic planting. There remains a requirement for a Masterplan to be prepared, which will be the subject of further consultation outside of the Vision 2031 process. This has been addressed under question 35.</p>	<p>No further changes required</p>

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Ref. Sustainability Development Principles (para 2) I do not feel that small wind turbines have proved to be effective; and I do not think that any wind turbine is appropriate for this area. The aesthetics of full roof solar panels will need careful evaluation.</p> <p>Ref. Delivery Principles. I welcome the statement in para.2 re full engagement of local community – but documentation should not be daunting or you will only get a narrow response.</p> <p>Ref. Haverhill NorthEast Landowner Preferred Option. It must be remembered that landowners' opinions are shaped by the professionals who earn salaries by selling as much land as possible. On occasion landowners do not sell all the land that is under consideration.</p> <p>Part B</p>		
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Mitigating Circumstances for the non encroachment of Calford Green as evidenced by underpinning documentation This present round of consultation is near a midpoint in the overall process. It is not yet the final plan. However 'Haverhill 2031' is underpinned by earlier documents and in particular The Core Strategy (which went to public examination in 2010), and approved Dec 2010, (CS), The Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009, (GIS), by the Preferred Options Document presented January 2012, (POD), and The Development Management Submission Document – Policy EB4 (Protection of the Landscape) (DMSD)</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<p>Also, 'Haverhill 2031' will hopefully have been shaped by Inspector Mike Moore's report statement following the public examination in which he said ' In the case of Calford Green, careful attention would be needed to achieve the landscaped buffer zone but I am satisfied that in principle this can be resolved through the AAP and the masterplanning process' .(para 14.4) I responded to these documents and also spoke at the public hearing. My detailed written input with reference numbers will be held in your records. The scrapping of the Regional Spacial Strategy, and the new announcement in the March 2012 budget has not materially affected my earlier views, as summarised below. In drawing up the next stage of Vision 2012 please consider the following points made in documentation.</p> <p>Sentences in italics are my comments on the documentation</p>		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no coalescence of Haverhill and surrounding settlements, and there will be green buffer zones between. (CS 3.2) Strategic landscape buffers will be identified to ensure that settlements do not become part of larger urban areas. CS 1) • A priority will need to be made to protect and enhance distinct landscapes and natural environment (GIS 2.16, 2.18) also (DMSD EB4 7.9; 7.12) Recognise the value of all landscapes ... which contribute to a sense of place (GIS 2.25) • It is important to reduce the visual intrusion of development. (DMSD EB4 7.11) • Green space and corridors contributes to maintain the distinctiveness and separate identity of surrounding villages (GIS 7.2) (D1SEBC09 fig 7.3) 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic landscape character defined by ...small settlements and village greens...will be conserved (GIS 7.24). The protection and conservation of green corridors and green spaces will be integral to achieving a high quality and sustainable environment (GIS 2.9) (POD 3.8) (D1SEBC09 fig 7). The Green at Calford Green is Kedington's only piece of common land, and the track across it leading towards Wilsey Farm is a designated wildlife corridor. • Areas designated as countryside will be protected from inappropriate development. Any new development will only be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) (POD Policy 4 b) All the land in question is believed to be Grade 2. 		

**Haverhill Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Your name	Organisation company if applicable	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Barbara Surridge				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy to protect rural characteristics of settlement is given (CS 3.3; 5.33). Building on this site to the full extent shown would blatantly disregard the recommendations in GIS –DISEBC – 09. Development will not harm the setting of listed buildings including inward and out ward views (POD policy 15.) There are 5 listed buildings in Calford Green and 2 more in the Essex hamlet of Kedington End, Sturmer that is contiguous with it. Until the 1904 boundary changes this was all one hamlet, and still operates as such now and all properties would be adversely affected by the proposed development. A curtilage and/ or setting which is appropriate to the listed building, and which maintains its relationship with its surroundings should be retained (POD Policy 15 g) • Development should not involve loss of open areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a place (CS2.3e) It is essential to give careful consideration to maintaining the identity character, and historical context of settlements (CS4.57) 		