

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Assessment of Rural 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 Rural 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>

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes	With the exception of local volunteer bus drivers. I feel this would be difficult to provide continuity.	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15720	Vion Food Group Ltd	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited	no	In Chapter 5 Princes Foundation Community Capital Visioning a series of positives and negatives are presented leading to a Princes Foundation Vision Statement. Only one of the six vision statements touch on employment matters. There is no substantive support given to the need for the creation and safeguarding of local employment in the rural area. This undermines the Rural Vision presented in Chapter 6 and the hope (presented later in Chapter 10 Jobs & Economy) that rural St Edmundsbury will be a place where villages have local jobs and are not simply dormitories. Therefore VION would like to suggest in response to Question 1 that recognition is given to the need to support small, medium and large indigenous and mobile employers deliver local employment in the rural area. This response links to our submission on the loss of employment land at Great Wratting attached at the end of this questionnaire.	Noted. Agree that an additional reference to rural employment is required.	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision statement for St Edmundsbury
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	The aim for an electric bus service run by volunteers is not considered as achievable as the other aims over which there is control through the planning system.	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Whilst we broadly agree with the vision: The vision of rural communities voluntarily running and operating electric bus services is not sustainable. It is beyond the collective ability of most communities to establish, maintain and fund such an aspiration. We praise the emphasis placed on preserving economic stability and note Vision 2031s acknowledgement of Clare as a main tourist centre. However, we advise that Clares underlying economy of tourism will be compromised by proposed wind farm development sites surrounding the town.	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	The 5 vision statements are agreeable but the transport proposal is very much an aspiration and its implementation can only be phased with public services and for the foreseeable future under these austere times with the motor car.	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	<p>The statements provide no Vision for the provision of new accommodation for Care for the elderly living within the rural area or adjoining major settlements such as Bury St. Edmunds. With 25% or more of the total population being within the elderly category, specialist accommodation either in single units or as part of a Care Village under the auspices of the concept of Continuing Care Retirement Communities is essential to fulfil the Vision required by the Borough during and beyond the Plan period. We have emphasised Care which can be provided in a range of accommodation, some specialist and also particularly in new Nursing homes.</p> <p>We believe it very important for the inhabitants of the Borough, that the Council are seen to take a proactive approach particularly with the private sector to establish the range of accommodation required to meet the new healthcare standards for the type of accommodation required.</p> <p>Therefore a new Vision Statement is required.</p>	Agree that reference to specialist residential care could be made within existing challenge	A reference to specialist residential care has been made in the key challenges for the rural area under 'ageing population'
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	Whilst the Society supports the thrust of this policy, it believes that pastiche should be discouraged in favour of high quality contemporary design that respects the architectural traditions of the area but does not slavishly replicate historic forms.	Policies on design are included within the Core Strategy and the Joint Development Management DPD	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Any bus service should be provided irrespective of volunteers. People should not be required to work for free to provide essential services. What are rates for?	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Is there a set standard for goods/services or are Key Service Centres provision seen as sufficient Bus services village to village or village to town New development tree belts within these are buffer to existing development? New type rural livelihoods what will these look like?	Core Strategy Policy CS4 establishes the settlement hierarchy which is based on the level of services and facilities in KSC and LSC.	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments 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 Rural Areas 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 expansion plans and population growth. Any new initiatives should be funded from sources other than the council tax.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	See above
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comments on the Vision statements at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	Looks broadly OK but the second bullet doesn't make sense and needs to be reworded.	These statements were created by the Prince's Foundation and form part of the evidence base for the Rural Vision.	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	<p>Risby Parish Council agrees with all the vision statements apart from the following: Rural communities will have a fully operational, small electric bus service run by volunteers and using local drivers</p> <p>The concept of a local bus service is excellent in principle but the reliance on volunteers is unrealistic. Village communities already struggle to get volunteers and are under pressure to run existing organisations.</p>	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Rural communities will have a fully operational, small electric bus service run by volunteers and using local drivers</p> <p>There is too much reliance on volunteers. Small villages cannot get enough volunteers already.</p>	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	I think it is too aspirational for the rural communities to have a small electric bus service, who would run them and it would have to be cohesive between villages, what about the much smaller villages ?	The Council recognises that to achieve these vision statements will require close and collaborative working with local communities and partners	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21606E	Tony MacDonald				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	what about village life. Expansion brings more traffic, noise and excessive building destroys environments and wildlife. Building more homes does not improve the countryside it destroys the views we have. people choose to live in the countryside to get away from the stress and strains of working life and choose their properties for that purpose we forget about the people already there and the impact on them.	The Rural Vision concentrates growth in those villages which are designated as Key and Local Service Centres leaving over 90% of the borough as designated countryside.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes	I would like a trees / landscape first "policy" etc planted well in advance of first brick laid. Thus encouraging wild life / aesthetic views has a good early start thus when the development is finished it is far more "harmonised" and wild life etc not having to play such a hard "Catch up"	The Council has no control over planting in advance of a development commencing.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no	It all sounds very good, but I am very concerned about the rural communities losing their separate identities, not to mention the huge volume of construction and domestic traffic that will be generated	Supporting local communities is an aspiration in homes and communities section of the document.	Amend aspiration 2 in 'homes and communities' to read 'Every village has a real sense of community and identity'
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				no	Transport not covered comprehensively, an aspiration	Transport is also covered in the rural vision and objectives and the Travel section of the document	No changes required

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

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 1a - Do you agree with the vision statements from the work of the Prince's Foundation?	Question 1b - If not, what would you change?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	I would have added something about ensuring that rural area remain attractive and desirable places to live for all sections of the community	These statements were created by the Prince's Foundation and form part of the evidence base for the Rural Vision. It is considered these issues are covered in the Rural Vision statement and the objectives.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15667	Matthew Hancock MP					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.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes	As long as the open spaces spoken of are adequate and that the houses are really needed by local people is the need really there for the numbers proposed?	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15720	Vion Food Group Ltd	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited	no	In Chapter 6 Rural Vision a draft vision for St Edmundsbury is set out identifying how the rural areas will grow and positively change over the plan period to 2031. Rural employment opportunities is mentioned only once in the supporting text (para 6.5) but not at all in the draft vision. VION considers the promotion of local employment opportunities a critical aspect of a forward looking and sustainable vision for the rural area. Therefore in response to the Vision's Question 2, VION would like to see an aspiration be incorporated to promote the rural economy including local employment opportunities. This response links to our submission on the loss of employment land at Great Wratting attached at the end of this questionnaire.	Agree that a reference to rural employment should be made in the Rural Vision statement	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision statement for St Edmundsbury
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision? While the commitment to the provision of community facilities within new developments and the retention of such facilities in existing settlements is welcomed there must be flexibility. The Council and Local Planning Policy must recognise that in the current economic circumstances the strict retention policy of community facilities is endangering the future of, in many cases historic, buildings creating opportunities for crime and a scar on the streetscape.	See Policy 41 of the Joint Development Management DPD which is a criteria based policy for community facilities and services.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
						Where community facilities have been demonstrated through a 12 month marketing campaign that there is no prospect of the market or local residents continuing the community use other alternative uses must be considered to secure the building through alternative use. Failure to acknowledge the need for preservation through use is to condemn many buildings and high streets to disrepair. The Rural Vision 2031 must include provision for the criteria based policies which would enable redundant community facilities to be converted to other uses so that they continue to contribute in a positive visual manner to the character of the area.	See above	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	<p>Housing Consideration of the local communities affected must be borne in mind at all times and not simply dictated by St Edmunds council. Horringer is deemed to be an infill village and there are in simple terms limited scope for housing development (as per our Parish Plan). Major growth could make the village part of Bury which is not what we want to see happen.</p> <p>Leisure Horringer has many locally arranged leisure facilities, as do many of the villages in the area. I am sure we would all appreciate support from St Eds to increase facilities. Increasing open spaces will always be difficult as most villages have grown up along major roadways but help to purchase or adapt sites would be welcomed and to maintain those sites. Grants for play equipment perhaps? to encourage use of these open spaces.</p>	Core Strategy Policy CS4 maintains the identity and separation of villages. While these facilities/improvements are desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide them. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council				Transport Footpaths in many villages need urgent attention now. We have asked for work to be carried out on footpaths bordering main roads but with little response so far so we would support the idea of improving this area. We would also welcome improving footpaths generally in villages and encouraging cycle paths, to link villages together, especially between Horringer and BSE, the nearest post office facility which is still some considerable distance away. Any improvement in public transport would be welcomed	See above	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Some 40% of population live in rural area but employment and housing provision is being focussed in towns forcing people to move into towns or elsewhere.	Rural employment is being encouraged in the draft vision and under Policy RV4 Rural Employment Areas	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant	Mr John Barber		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			no	<p>Whilst we broadly agree with the aspirations : Clare is designated to take 20% of the new housing in the rural areas but our infrastructure is crumbling after many years of minimal authority investment. The emphasis on basing facilities in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, coupled with reduced public transport severely limits options for non-car owners. It is better to target money at improving facilities in Key Service Centres. Upgrading footpaths and cycle routes is commendable, but costly and cannot be accommodated by the Precept. There are no mechanisms to ensure that affordable housing goes to local people. These should be put in place to create a specific requirement which Clare Parish Council will insist upon for all affordable housing developments</p> <p>There has been a significant increase in the size and weight of HGV using the A1092. This compromises pedestrian safety, the foundations and fabric of historic buildings, road surfaces, pavements and drainage systems. We therefore submit that the following be included:</p>	Noted - there are mechanisms which can be used to ensure general affordable housing is for local people. Exception site housing can be identified for local people.	No changes required
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>The historic buildings and underlying road and infrastructure systems of rural villages and towns will be protected from the destructive effects of modern articulated HGV transit.</p> <p>Given SEBC's commitment to reducing CO2 emissions, we also suggest:</p> <p>All new developments should take maximum advantage of energy efficiency through solar panels for water heating and electricity.</p>	Noted that HGV traffic can be a problem in rural areas and that reference to this should be made in the document.	Acknowledge that HGV traffic can be a problem in rural areas in the Travel section of the document
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	We would ask how the borough will deliver this vision in Wickhambrook on the basis of the proposals under RV 20.	The vision is for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no	The Draft Vision with respects to mobility is truly reflecting by 2031 and does not address the period between 2012 to 2031. This aspect regarding transportation as with the Prince's Foundation is too aspirational.	The vision is for the period up to 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	yes	Yes, subject to the points made in Q1 above where there needs to be emphasis placed on the provision of Care in appropriate residential accommodation.	Agree that a reference should be made.	A reference to specialist residential care has been made in the key challenges for the rural area 'ageing population'
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Difficult to see how BC can deliver vision in Wickhambrook r.e. proposals under RV20 It is vitally important that small villages are able provide affordable housing for young people.	The vision is for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society believes that sustainable rural communities are based upon a strong and vibrant rural economy. Accordingly we believe that greater emphasis needs to be afforded to the provision of local employment opportunities that are compatible with the distinctive character of the local area.	Agree that a reference should be made.	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision for St Edmundsbury
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Yes - In setting out a profile of the rural area (chapter 3) the RV2031 DPD notes that there is little local employment in the rural areas and that many people commute to jobs elsewhere. It also confirms that the proportion of people who work in the village where they live is much lower than in either of the two towns. From a sustainability point of view, the RV2031 DPD seeks to address this situation through the provision of rural employment sites, but this initiative is not mentioned in the draft Rural Vision (p.18), which makes no reference to this key employment issue.	Agree that a reference should be made.	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision for St Edmundsbury
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	No mention of calming the A14 which is a most dangerous road where HGV appear to be able to behave badly without any sanctions.	Agree that reference to the A14 should be made in the travel section	Acknowledgement of the role of the A14 in the rural areas made in Travel section
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	More consideration to peoples views on their quality of life.	This comment falls outside the scope of this document	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Existing housing/environment integrated or will new development only have these benefits taken into hand?	The vision is for the whole rural areas for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b).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 Haverhill.	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
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council does not oppose the draft Rural vision, and welcomes the reference to sustainable transport options. We would suggest that more emphasis could be placed on the unique and special qualities of the rural areas, in terms of the natural and built environment.	Agree	New paragraph inserted in final rural vision statement on supporting and maintaining the unique and special qualities of the rural area
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Nothing omitted except how these laudable aims will be achieved. The prince's vision is of a sustainable countryside, which cannot be achieved without adequate infrastructure, employment and the will of people to live in the country and participate in realising a cohesive community there.	The vision is for the whole rural areas for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	I feel it is very important to mention local employment opportunities as these are necessary to achieve the rest of the rural areas' vision.	Agree that a reference should be made.	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision for St Edmundsbury
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes	Yes, insufficient attention and provision for wildlife and food sustainability with agricultural land being converted to housing.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	The development east in Barrow has not been thought about in regards to .The pavements are inadequate, not wide enough away from fast moving lorries. You quote open spaces but the planning in Barrow proposes to fill these. The development on Barrow hill is not easily accessible to the centre of the village making it an individual estate on the outskirts not close to ammenties,schools ,playing fields because people are busy everyone will drive to school to drop children off parking is a major issue already.	The allocated sites at Barrow Hill will need to ensure improvements are made to footpaths to allow good access to the services and facilities in the village.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	It is too open and should be more defined as this will lead to "development in favour of Developers	The vision is for the whole rural area for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21677E	Mark Filler				no	If a large number of houses are being built in isolated rural areas, i.e. Hopton, employment opportunities will have to be sought well beyond Bury St Edmunds and therefore appropriate public transport links will be required to access places such as Norwich, Ipswich, Cambridge. A volunteer run bus service to Bury St Edmunds will not be sufficient to support the proposed population growth.	The vision is for the whole rural area for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Re assess certain villages that have natural infill or could easily have their boundaries extended rather than focusing on settlements that have good levels of infrastructure. How can you grow a village to become sustainable without development?	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Joint Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no	I am particularly concerned about the density of housing and do wonder if all the thriving local services will actually materialise. Are all the proposed houses actually going to be needed? The increase in the volume of traffic is a major issue	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
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 2: Draft Vision

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 2a Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas?	Question 2b - Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				no	The Draft Vision with respects to mobility is truly reflecting by 2031and does not address the period between 2012 to 2031. This aspect regarding transportation as with the Princes Foundation is too aspirational.	The vision is for the whole rural area for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no	Nothing about safeguarding and promoting the rural economy and related jobs, particularly in farming and agriculture	Agree that a reference should be made.	A reference to rural employment has been made in the final rural vision for St Edmundsbury

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15720	Iain Wardrop	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes	Most of the key challenges have been identified. In addition to the challenges set out in the Rural Vision one of the key challenges is maintaining an adequate supply of housing for local people.	Agree that reference should be made to specialist residential care.	A reference to specialist residential care has been made in the key challenges for the rural area 'ageing population'
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	We would stress improvements in all the areas mentioned especially Broadband, where communications is not just for businesses but also for daily life. Improving Transport and traffic management should be added as a project. With the proposed growth planned for the area in Vision 2031 considerable thought must be given to the traffic infrastructure of the area too. Increasing businesses and housing will bring major congestion and increased traffic movement. With the siting of the new hospital to the west of BSE, we have grave concerns over the potential significant growth in traffic flow through the village of Horringer and how existing roads can possibly cope. There have recently been major accidents on the road between Horringer and Westley.	Agree that transport and traffic management should be added as a key challenge.	Transport and traffic management in the rural areas has been added as a key challenge

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Dual use of schools is fine in term time but in school holidays the village hall picks up bookings as the school is not available.	Exploring the dual use of schools will include assessing ability for use at weekends and school holidays.	Insert additional paragraph about exploring use of these facilities when schools are shut.
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	Specific reference should be made to the need to encourage and support the provision of recreational facilities. It is not clear how development in Rural Areas will facilitate the extension of broadband coverage.	The need for recreational facilities is made in Culture and Leisure section	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			no	Development of Key Service Centres Given: An ageing rural population The lack of transport and general mobility The need to encourage younger people to stay/move to rural areas The effect of internet shopping The need to reinvigorate local centre economies and local community involvement We believe that far more emphasis should be placed on developing Key Service Centres rather than the two main towns. This is particularly important in a rural vision document.	The Core Strategy establishes the settlement hierarchy for the borough. Local communities have the opportunity to explore further developing their communities through neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders as in Policy RV2	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	We note that the Borough's vision of reducing housing densities of a minimum of 30/ha would not apply if their proposal for Wickhambrook under RV 20 goes ahead	Site densities are looked at on a site by site basis.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes	Yes, we do agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas. We do not consider that any cross subject challenges have been missed.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	Your Statement on 'An Ageing Population' is not sufficient in the context of the Borough. Its main thrust is on the improvement or adaption of existing accommodation. There are not sufficient resources to carry out this sole provision and there needs to be very substantial input from the private sector in the provision of accommodation and specialist accommodation to provide the levels of care required for the rural community in particular. This is most particularly so where residents require 'Nursing home' provision and where the private sector is and will be the leading provider of this specialist accommodation in the future. The Borough does not have sufficient specialist care accommodation particularly in the provision of Nursing homes to fulfil the requirement and the needs of the Borough in general and particularly for the urban area of Bury St. Edmunds as detailed in reports previously provided to the Borough by our Clients.	Agree that reference should be made to specialist residential care.	A reference to residential care has been made in the key challenges for the rural area 'ageing population'
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	We consider the six themes are relevant and cover a sufficient spread of principal issues relating to the vitality, viability and attractiveness of rural areas. Empowering local residents to make full use of existing facilities such as village halls, and to encourage jobs and activities for young people is particularly pertinent to aid social cohesion.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	There is a conflict r.e housing densities between urban levels and desirable rural levels particularly in relation to Wickhambrook RV20	Site densities are looked at on a site by site basis.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				Further to our response to Question 2, we believe that rural employment opportunities are a key challenge for all age groups not just the youth. The provision and growth of sustainable employment opportunities for rural communities is of paramount importance.	Agree	Amend challenge so that reference is made to the need for local rural employment for all age sectors
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Yes employment and provision of new jobs. This is only partly covered by young people and jobs. There needs to be specific reference to the need for rural employment sites to help reduce out-commuting from villages to jobs elsewhere.	Employment sites are covered in Policy RV4. Agree that reference should be broadened beyond young people	Amend challenge so that reference is made to the need for local rural employment for all age sectors
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Education in citizenship is less important than a comprehensive basic education that produces people who can read, write, do maths and use English correctly. Do this and everything else will follow.	This comment falls outside the scope of this document	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	I recognise that more of this is taking place now. What will jobs be like self employed in community based work? Control over vehicles based movements particularly larger vehicles into villages Guidelines/training/support of Police. Avoid residents taking life into their own hands.	The vision is for the whole rural area for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies.	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens residents			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council does not disagree with these challenges for the rural areas, and we welcome the references to broadband and an ageing population, which we see as key issues for local authorities and communities together. We would suggest that climate change ought to be referenced as a key challenge; we see it as one of the biggest challenges facing us both globally and locally.	Consider the issues are adequately covered in the objectives and the section on Sustainability.	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				Paragraph 3.11. (ii): Update reference to Knettishall Heath, the site is now owned and managed by Suffolk Wildlife Trust and not Suffolk County Council.	Agree	Paragraph updated.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	One significant factor is the overwhelming weight of evidence that people prefer to live in towns not villages. Another is that 90% of mortgages are currently being taken on older properties, not new build. Even with the government's 5% deposit scheme new housing in villages are likely to become assets to sell for the upwardly mobile. As a result the social cohesion of the rural vision will be lost.	This comment falls outside the scope of this document	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	Not sure exactly how you define a cross-subject challenge, but in the same way that broadband is identified as very important, I feel a viable/adequate public transport service to Bury also matters a lot and should perhaps be included here.	Agree	Transport and traffic management in the rural areas has been added as a key challenge
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	Risby Parish Council agrees with the key cross-subject challenges but feels that there is one subject that has been missed - rural funding. To achieve this rural vision there would need to be an increase in rural spending when in reality the opposite is the case. The key challenge for rural communities is lack of resources, both in terms of finding volunteers and not having enough money to improve the quality of services provided.	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	More information needs to be given about how these visions will be funded.	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no	Insufficient plans for widening of roads, facilities and flood mitigation	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion	Will the Borough LISTEN to people with genuine local knowledge and act upon it. Development YES it is evolution, but not high village build (20+ with little progress on the infrastructural need for the village to grow internally and not become a dormitory village	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
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	Public Transport is a key challenge for all rural areas	Agree	Transport and traffic management in the rural areas has been added as a key challenge

Rural Vision 2031
Question 3: Cross Subject Challenges

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 3a - Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?	Question 3b - Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why do you think they are significant.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Don't forget affordable rural housing and allowing people to build in villages that they prefer, rather than those that the council prefer to be developed	Agree	An adequate supply of affordable housing has been added as a key challenge
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	The need to tackle social isolation as an important determinant of health and wellbeing, particularly in for older people.	Agree	Paragraph updated to include need to tackle social isolation
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	Missed out is the impact of the move towards a society which must be less dependent on fossil fuels for domestic use. Many rural properties are currently dependent on heating oil, for example. Many villages have an infrastructure which is car-dominated and indeed car-dependent.	Sustainability aspirations aim to address these issues. Agree that traffic management in rural areas is an issue.	Transport and traffic management in the rural areas has been added as a key challenge

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	Where community facilities have been demonstrated through a 12 month marketing campaign that there is no prospect of the market or local residents continuing the community use other alternative uses must be considered to secure the building through alternative use. Failure to acknowledge the need for preservation through use is to condemn many buildings and high streets to disrepair.	See Policy DM41 of the Joint Development Management DPD which is a criteria based policy for community facilities and services.	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	A good idea but one that will need considerable support from St Eds to make it work. Smaller villages do not have the man power, time, knowledge and abilities to coordinate such plans and are concerned about decisions being forced on them because of this fact. Some of these decisions could permanently alter the quality of village life it is the appeal of village life that attracts people to live in a village in the first place and not in a town. St Eds need to be very proactive in supporting local communities so that a Neighbourhood plan is prepared to help protect village life. We also feel that there should be maximum flexibility permitted in decision making a developer may feel a project is justified but local opinions may not agree and those opinions should not simply be ignored, even if they do conflict with the Local Development Plans.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas.	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Seemed as though it would help with housing in rural areas but as it must comply with core policy and local planning policy and apparently will take some two years to achieve a plan it is not what it seems.	The lengthy process of preparation for the Rural Vision document is as a result of the need to comply with the national planning regulations.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			no	It has always been the Parish Council's position that, subject to improved infra-structure, 100 houses is a more acceptable level to ensure maintenance of the character of Clare. We believe that new developments should meet the requirements set out in the Prince's Foundation Community Capital Visioning - Looking After Home and Country section - advising that new developments should use local building styles.	Building styles are determined in development briefs and at the planning application stage. Good design is encouraged through policies in the Joint Development Management DPD and the Core Strategy.	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	There needs to be consideration to the resources available and required by the local communities. The process will require the key elements resourced through the local authority.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	Noteworthy, and particularly so given our proposal for Risby, is the first bullet point that proposals for development will be considered favourably if they meet at least a minimum level of growth as set out in the Core Strategy. We consider, and will demonstrate, that Risby is capable of an additional 5 units, i.e. a total of 25 units.	Noted. The site capacity has been assessed and is capable of supporting 20 dwellings	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			no	Neighbourhood Plan should be able to accommodate lower growth and housing density if that is the intention of the local community.	The localism act states that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan	The need to conform with strategic policies has been included in the Policy.
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	<p>The powers and limitations of Neighbourhood Plans are clearly set out in the Localism Act and this policy appears redundant because it is simply a restatement of the statutory position. The Borough does not appear to be giving positive encouragement to this important new tier of plans in accordance with paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Key Service centres</p> <p>The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031</p>	It is considered important to reflect the requirements of the localism act and NPPF in terms of neighbourhood planning in the Vision documents.	Supporting text to policy RV2 has been updated to reflect NPPF paragraphs 183-185

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion	It is too early for a judgement to be made for a relatively small community. The costs involved in setting a Neighbourhood Plan may be prohibitive and although these would provide a statutory right to set a plan this, nevertheless, must fit with the Borough Council's broader plan	Comments noted.	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Not sympathetic to existing residents.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Plans identified by local communities Transparent not built around what developers wish to see or impose	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group.			no	<p>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, or indeed if any development at all should go ahead. as part of any neighbourhood plan, It must also be linked to the Visions for Bury and Haverhill.</p> <p>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.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council does not disagree with the content of the proposed policy for neighbourhood planning, but we do question the need for it, as it does not do anything more than simplify national guidance. We also wonder why there is a policy for the rural areas, but no similar one for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, which are equally able to develop neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders. Perhaps a more important consideration would be on how the borough council is going to support the development of neighbourhood plans, outlining as much as possible given that both the borough and county councils are still developing an approach.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas.	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				This policy appears to largely repeat national planning policy and legislations (NPPF and the Localism Act). We query the inclusion of such a policy and recommend that it should be removed if it does not add further local clarification to the situation.	It is considered important to reflect the requirements of the localism act and NPPF in terms of neighbourhood planning in the Vision documents.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no	Overall neighbourhood planning is acceptable, but the whole use of orders is open to abuse and influence.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas.	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	It is not clear to me from pp20-21 whether the neighbourhood plan would be required to respect the development boundaries defined in the Rural Vision document. I would not want a neighbourhood plan to be able to be used as a way of getting around the planned and considered development vision defined in the Rural Vision.	The localism act states that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan	The need to conform with strategic policies has been included in the Policy.
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue					disagree with limitation on plans saying they cannot reduce level of growth from the Core Strategy.	The localism act states that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan	The need to conform with strategic policies has been included in the Policy.
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no	The Core Strategy and National Planning Policy do not reflect the needs and concerns of rural communities. Neighbourhood Plans are complicated to produce, they will be costly and unaffordable for local communities and will not allow villages to be heard because of the constraints of existing planning policy. Risby Parish Council feels its responses to previous consultations have been ignored even though these responses reflected the views of local residents as set out in the Parish Plan.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no	<p>The Core Strategy and National Planning Policy do not reflect the needs and concerns of rural communities. Small villages are not allowed any development outside the Housing Settlement Boundary other than affordable housing. No account is taken of local need and existing planning policy is completely inflexible to the wishes needs of local communities. Many small villages would like to be allowed limited, small scale development of single houses. Councils would like to be given more say in what development is allowed as they have local knowledge.</p> <p>Planning policy does not allow development in smaller villages as it is not sustainable, yet this is contradicted by the fact that affordable development is allowed. If villages can build affordable housing, then this invalidates the sustainability criteria in the Core Strategy</p>	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Joint Development Management document.	Additional text inserted in Infill Villages and Countryside section to reference this change

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				No development of any kind should be allowed in a village if it is unsustainable or the criteria could be broadened to reflect local need. Local need may include affordable housing, but there should also be provision made for older residents who retire and want to downsize but stay within the community or to provide annexes/outbuildings within existing properties for residents who cannot afford market rents. Current policy only allows for holiday lets. SCCs new Flexicare policy which is aimed at helping elderly residents stay in their homes would require flexibility within the planning system as they may wish to downsize and stay within the community or live in an annexe	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>Increasing costs for rural communities business rates for village halls, increased costs for emptying bins. The more SEBC charges for these services, the more financial pressure village halls are facing. There is only a finite amount of money which can be raised through fund raising and revenue from letting halls. Because of the high cost of housing, the age demographic in villages is weighted towards older residents who can afford the higher prices. There needs to be a policy in place which will help achieve a better balance in villages.</p> <p>Will this Rural Vision be constrained by local planning policy? If the planning framework does not change, a lot of the aspirations will not be possible.</p>	The vision is for the whole rural area for 2031 and will require close working with key organisations and agencies. Housing numbers	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no	<p>Development of new housing should be sited in areas which are not already burdened with heavy traffic. Rural areas which include agricultural land is being converted into housing land - we do not see any plans for food sustainability. We are being encouraged to 'grow our own' , yet valuable fertile land for agriculture is being converted to housing. Importing food will increase our county's carbon footprint when we rely on other countries to produce much needed food items.</p>	The location of housing is in accordance with the infrastructure and environmental capacity of the settlement.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird					Can any plan guarantee that the houses will not impact on existing village peoples lives we are already a community which would not be enhanced but shattered through expansion to this degree.	The localism act states that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan. Once a Plan has been produced It will be for the local community to vote on whether a Neighbourhood Plan should be adopted.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Parishes that have achieved Parish Plans etc should be heard AND listen too and acted upon the result from these consultation. As this is a excellent base line to work from and represents a sound base from which to make the right decisions for that village. Developers should be held accountable if these are not only implemented but improved upon for future generations to benefit.	The Council will provide appropriate support to those communities who wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans or Parish Plans for their areas. Neighbourhood plans can influence where development occurs in an area.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 4: Neighbourhood Plans (RV1)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 4a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?	Question 4b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes	Neighbourhood plans are required to be in line with national policy and hence this policy cannot suggest otherwise.	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes	So long as active engagement is sought	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no	I would like to see the proposal for land at site reference RV9b removed as I object to its' inclusion.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no	I would hope that the feelings of the existing local community would be taken into consideration before any final plans are made.	The localism act states that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan. Once a Plan has been produced It will be for the local community to vote on whether a Neighbourhood Plan should be adopted.	No changes required
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15720	Iain Wardrop	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited	no	In Chapter 8 Rural Objectives, Objective 2 states 'to maintain and develop the rural economic base through the provision of rural employment sites'. VION concurs with this objective but would add that the absence of an immediate requirement to use land adjacent to an operational business for expansion is not a valid reason to de-zone that land from Employment use. Therefore in response to the Vision's Question 5, VION suggest that the following is added to the end of Objective 2 'and the safeguarding of existing employment land'. This response links to our submission on the loss of employment land at Great Wratting attached at the end of this questionnaire.	The objective as drafted, along with Core Strategy objective B, are adequate to ensure the development of the rural economic base. The safeguarding of individual sites is looked at on a site by site basis. Objective 2 has been merged with objective 3 as they are very similar.	Objective 2 has been merged with objective 3 as they are very similar.
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			no	There is also no reference to biodiversity or habitats in any of the 10 objectives in section 8 of the Rural Vision or in the 9 objectives in section 4 of the Bury St Edmunds Vision.	This is specifically covered by Objective H of the Core Strategy and is indirectly referred to in Objective 5 of the rural vision	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	<p>Taking into account the fact these rural objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives (see Appendix 4); do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?</p> <p>Where community facilities have been demonstrated through a 12 month marketing campaign that there is no prospect of the market or local residents continuing the community use other alternative uses must be considered to secure the building through alternative use.</p> <p>Failure to acknowledge the need for preservation through use is to condemn many buildings and high streets to disrepair.</p> <p>The Rural Vision 2031 must include provision for the criteria based policies which would enable redundant community facilities to be converted to other uses so that they continue to contribute in a positive visual manner to the character of the area.</p>	See Policy 41 of the Joint Development Management DPD which is a criteria based policy for community facilities and services.	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes	<p>The Council has correctly identified the key rural objectives. Objective 1 and 4 are particularly important, with provision of housing to support the existing population an important parameter in meeting the needs of many rural villages. The provision of new housing will help support some of the other objectives of the rural vision, by providing funding to deliver infrastructure, employment and community services identified under objectives 2, 3 and 4.</p>	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	<p>Transport/congestion management could be an objective</p> <p>We are also concerned that local opinions should not be ignored in any of these objectives.</p>	The efficient movement of people is covered in Objective F of the Core Strategy.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	Can planning policies achieve the provision of broadband to all rural communities? Support for the remaining objectives.	The achievement of these objectives will require close and collaborative working with other partners and organisations	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	See answer to question 3	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Strong need to support the rural amenities and services	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	yes	We fully support Objective 1 but would add that you should include the word 'new' before the word 'housing' in the 4th line and also include the words 'and specialist 'Care' accommodation for an ageing population.	Consider objective as drafted adequately states approach to housing for an ageing population which may not always be new.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	Objective 1 should be widened to include the mix and type of housing, rather than merely the provision of affordable homes. Suggested wording 'with particular emphasis on the provision of affordable housing and an appropriate mix of house types (including for private ownership) for local people'.	Agree	Amend third line of Objective 1 to read 'of affordable homes and an appropriate mix of house types for local people.'
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR15849	Mr Brian Barrow	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd		The Thurlow Estate		The Thurlow Estate particularly agree with Objective 4 and Objective 8. Their experience with villages such as Great and Little Thurlow and Withersfield, where they own a number of properties, is that it is difficult for the villages in their current form to support the school, pre school shop, garage, churches, recreation ground and other facilities. Development is essential bring new life to the villages.	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports these objectives.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes	For Objective 5 it is essential that an quantitative need is established before any sites are considered for Gypsy & Traveller Sites	The provision of gypsy and traveller sites is based on a needs assessment.	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	No	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Not sympathetic to existing residents.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Objective 2 - Rural employment for local people Objective 5&6 - very important Objective 9 - support for existing housing? Otherwise run the risk of 'two tier' standards	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR15930	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				We are in agreement that the draft objectives for the Rural Vision 2031 relate with the Strategic Spatial Objectives set out in the Core Strategy. We are particularly supportive of objectives 5 and 9.	Comments noted and support welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process.			yes	Yes with qualifications given below in b). 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 Haverhill. 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.	Amend third line of Objective 1 to read 'of affordable homes and an appropriate mix of house types for local people.'

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural objectives must not repeat the Core Strategy objectives, do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those						

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council welcomes these objectives, particularly the references to the ageing population, high speed broadband delivery, 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.	Consider that Objective G of the Core Strategy adequately sets out the approach in relation to natural and built character of rural areas.	Objective 6: Amend to read '...existing settlement, services and facilities including local employment opportunities, to help to reduce...' Objective 9: Amend to read 'To ensure that development is built to high standards and addresses environmental sustainability considerations
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	Whilst i applaud the 10 objectives laid out here, i cannot see how 3,4,5,6,7 & 10 can be achieved at current funding levels, by either St Eds or County. I would not approve of Section 106 monies being dubiously allocated from inappropriate developments as a way of achieving these objectives.	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR21088E	Simon Amstutz	Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project			no	Objective 5 should include the need to ensure that any new development does not compromise wildlife habitats and protect heritage assets, in addition to current wording	This is specifically covered by Objective H of the Core Strategy and is indirectly referred to in Objective 5 of the rural vision	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	There perhaps ought to be an objective recognising the importance of ensuring high standards of local drainage, road, street lighting, sewerage, electricity and (where relevant) mains gas services are maintained in spite of new development.	This is specifically covered by Objective I of the Core Strategy and is indirectly referred to in Objective 3 of the rural vision	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Objective 7: mentions cycleway and footway improvements but not road or parking improvements, both of which are needed in Kedington. It is not possible, or fair, to try to reduce car dependency by putting unrealistic limits on parking provision, especially where public transport alternatives are uncompetitive.	Suffolk County Council has adopted Parking Standards which the council must adhere to. While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no	Development of new housing should be sited in areas which are not already burdened with heavy traffic. Rural areas which include agricultural land is being converted into housing land - we do not see any plans for food sustainability. We are being encouraged to 'grow our own' , yet valuable fertile land for agriculture is being converted to housing. Importing food will increase our county's carbon footprint when we rely on other countries to produce much needed food items.	The location of housing is based on the infrastructure and environmental capacity of an area.	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	These developments won't be affordable housing for the village it will be to ease housing in other areas. too much affordable housing brings with it own problems and stretches village resources and unwanted changes.	The provision of affordable housing is an important part of the vision to meet the needs of the community as set out in Objective 1	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	There needs to emphasis on the core of the village being not only maintained but enhanceable not only present but the future as well Shop /PO (?)Surgeries etc	Maintaining and enhancing existing community services and facilities is a key part of Objective 4	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 5: Draft Objectives

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 5a - Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?	Question 5b - Taking into account the fact these rural 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
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Objective 6 and 8 should be more closely interlinked	Objective 6 is seeking to reduce car dependency and Objective 8 is seeking to preserve village identity. No change required	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15817	David Lowe	EWS Chartered Surveyors			no	Representation On Fornham St. Martin And Proposed Boundary Fornham St. Martin is identified in the above as an 'Infill' Village. We represent that the no. of dwellings to be developed in such locations should take into account the sites available and location of any site in a settlement. Fornham St.Martin is illustrated in the document, effectively, as two settlements, divided by an undeveloped 'core' area shown as 'countryside'. It is, in fact, horse paddocks. The proposed theoretical division of Fornham St. Martin, in this way, is not reasonable or practical. The boundary should surround the whole, with planning policy and local discussions determining future uses for the 'core' of the village. We represent that the boundary is modified accordingly.	The purpose of a housing settlement boundary is to define the extent of the village where further development may be permitted. The inclusion of open land within the village is completely contrary to these aims and would allow further growth of an inappropriate scale.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion	Horringer is deemed as an infill village and therefore we see little prospect of further housing development.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Produce settlement boundaries for all villages to allow some building rather than stifle all rural housing into a few villages, a very disappointing policy for the rural area.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	If allocated land is found to be unsuitable for development or not made available for development then a clause should be inserted that other land may be considered with the agreement of the Parish Council and District Council.	Parishes have the opportunity to allocate sites by producing a Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Agree subject to concerns stated in letter.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			no	Wickhambrook is a collection of hamlets and one settlement boundary, only within the main village will, ultimately, urbanise that area. A practical approach to nurturing the continued viability of the whole of the village should be considered.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Yes, but the local planning authority needs to have the ability to respond to a structured development plan from that local community or Parish Council to address local needs.	Parishes have the opportunity to do this through the Neighbourhood Plan process	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	The settlement boundary of Bury St. Edmunds should be re-drawn to include the whole of Nowton Park and Nowton Court within the urban boundary of the town as the Park fulfils the role as an urban green space benefiting the residents on the south and south-eastern side of Bury St. Edmunds touching as it does the existing town boundary. The Park does not fill a rural role, is not in agriculture and more appropriately seeks to fulfil a role of functions for the benefit of the inhabitants of the urban area of Bury St. Edmunds and should be properly classified, allocated and defined within the boundary of the Borough. This is even more so given that the potential strategic housing releases contemplated for the south-east sector of Bury St Edmunds.	The purpose of a housing settlement boundary is to define the extent of where further development may be permitted. The inclusion of open land within the town is completely contrary to these aims and would allow further growth of an inappropriate scale.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	We consider the shaded area (pink) on map 12.11 for Risby is unrelated to the existing site boundaries or, indeed, the southern extremity of development, as defined by Alexander Way. An enlargement of the site to include the existing south field boundary (noting the route of Public Footpath 2) would be entirely consistent with the established settlement boundary whilst remaining a low density development appropriate in scale and form to the village's identity.	The size of the site at Risby is appropriate in scale to the rest of the village and its designation as a Local Service Centre.	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15849	Mr Brian Barrow	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd		The Thurlow Estate	no	The Thurlow Estate wish to comment on Withersfield which has been designated an infill village. It is considered that if St Edmundsbury Borough is going to meet its rural objectives, particularly Objectives 4 and 8, my client would hope that St Edmundsbury Borough Council would look favourably on limited small scale development for housing, commercial, or both. Often such smaller villages also help support neighbouring village services. Attention is drawn to Paragraph 55 of the New National Planning Policy Framework which states that development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Withersfield is not far from Great and Little Thurlow where village facilities such as the shop, garage and public house need support.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			no	Past Housing densities and settlement boundaries have urbanised certain villages and particularly the centre of Wickhambrook. Reduced density will equal lower land value and allow small villages to survive.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society believes that Housing Settlement Boundaries should be reviewed as part of any Neighbourhood Plan and that the aspirations of the local community should take priority. If a Neighbourhood Plan is not progressed, the default boundary should be that defined in Appendix 3. The Society objects to the inclusion of land at Uphorpe Road, Stanton (RV10(a)) as this would harm the setting of the adjacent grade II* listed Mill contrary to s.66(1) of the PI (Lb & Ca) Act 1990.	Parishes have the opportunity to allocate sites through the Neighbourhood Plan process. The Stanton site has been granted on appeal so has been removed as a future allocation.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no	<p>The settlement boundary in Low Street Bardwell excludes two barn properties that were converted a few years ago. Further development/exception site has been previously rejected due to objections relating to flooding and environmental issues. It is understood these may now have been overcome and the Parish Council has received a presentation for a projected small development at Street Farm on which we have the following comments: -</p> <p>The scheme as described is interesting, well thought out, a good mix of properties and sympathetic to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Councillors are aware that plans could alter significantly during the planning process and, therefore, the Parish Council is currently unable to confirm at this stage whether or not it will support development at Street Farm.</p>	The Street Farm site has not been allocated in the Rural Vision as this is an important open gap separating the two parts of the village which should be maintained.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council				<p>However, if/when a formal planning application is submitted to St Edmundsbury Borough Council, then the Parish Council will be invited to respond/make observations, and will consider its decision based on the plans submitted at that time along with other relevant details.</p> <p>There are major concerns relating to the poor water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure in this area, heightened by a significant number of planning applications which have already been granted or have been submitted. If a formal application is made the Parish Council would require assurances that extensive relevant research is carried out before any further planning permission is granted.</p> <p>In view of this consideration should therefore be given to extending the settlement boundary to encompass this area.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	<p>Object to deletion of settlement boundaries for outlying areas of Stanton north of the A143 and at Stanton Grove Park.</p> <p>Stanton clearly has a defined centre and core area, but there are clearly settlement areas on the outskirts of the village that should be part of a defined settlement boundary. This is justified by the fact that Stanton is the largest Key Service Centre in the Borough and, outside of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, is the most sustainable location for new development. Stanton (Shepherd's Grove) also represents the largest defined rural employment area (53ha) and will be a key aspect of the objective to reduce out-commuting from villages by providing additional jobs and business opportunities on their outskirts.</p>	Agree. There are other policies elsewhere in the Local Plan which control development in this location.	Re-instate the housing settlement boundary at Shepherd's Grove Mobile Home Park and north of Stanton.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	I only have detailed knowledge of the Rougham area; here the proposed housing settlement boundary appears to exclude the barn conversions at the south end of Kingshall Street, which exist today, and propose an addition to the housing settlement boundary which extends the village away from its centre and the school/church/shop, which is counter intuitive.	The barn conversions are not included within the housing settlement boundary as they are separated from the village boundary by countryside where there is a presumption against further development.	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Areas considered and there are many that could be used for any housing planned.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Does further development resulting in boundaries being redrawn run the risk of bringing other greenfield sites into contention at a later date? Views of community before future proposals a must Avoid entering into a cycle of 'development opportunities' continually being sought	Planning for future development needs is an ongoing process and will not stop at 2031. Consultation on Local Plans is undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				We assume that this question refers to the policy on housing settlement boundaries, for which we have no comment, rather than the policy itself. Despite this, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the fact that many of these housing settlement boundaries do not take in school sites (Bardwell, Barrow, etc), and whether or not SEBC feels that this might hamper the future development of school facilities.	Excluding school sites from the settlement envelope protects these sites from being developed for other unsuitable uses should the school site become vacant. There is no evidence to suggest that this common approach has hampered the development of school facilities in the past or will do so in the future.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no	I think any development should take place within existing boundaries unless adequate local employment and infrastructure are available beforehand; otherwise extending boundaries will merely add to traffic and defeat the aim of rural sustainability.	There are often opportunities for small scale development within villages which can come forward without the need for an allocation. Greenfield sites are only allocated in the lack of further opportunities for growth on brownfield sites.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				no	Kedington: Proposed site RV9b Limes Cottage: 40 homes will exceed the capacity of the local road infrastructure, and should be no more than 20. Area shown as recreational land off Haverhill Road, adjacent to Stonecross flats, has not been used for this purpose for at least 20 years.	RV9b Site access is considered suitable by Suffolk County Highways. Agree that area of recreational open land should be deleted.	Amend Proposals Map to remove area of recreational land to the north and to illustrate as countryside.
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21430E	Michael Hendry	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited	C/O Agent	no	The settlement boundary for Clare does not include an area to accommodate the access road to the north of the Nethergate Street Properties between the existing (RV7 (a) and proposed (RV7 (b) allocations. The settlement boundary must be adjusted to include such a vital piece of infrastructure.	Comments noted	Site RV7b has been removed due to the level of objections received.
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no	Proposed 20 houses in Risby is at odds with 'maintain & enhance rural area's distinctive natural & built environment'	The allocation in Risby is in accordance with the environmental capacity of the village and its designation as a Local Service Centre	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no	These boundaries have been drawn up without consulting local communities. Rural communities have local knowledge and would like the flexibility to adjust the HSB to reflect local need.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no	These boundaries have been drawn up without consulting local communities. Rural communities have local knowledge and would like the flexibility to adjust the HSB to reflect local need.	There will be provision for limited infill development in areas of countryside under Policy DM28 of the Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion	I can only comment on Great Barton	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	housing boundaries are there to stop us losing the environment that people have chosen to live in.there are enough other sites which would not impact and destroy the beauty of our surrounding countryside we have chosen to live in.what right do planners have to take away my right to a quality of life and surround my families causing stress and anxiety and destroying our privacy. we had to abide by rules when building our home but the boundaries all change when a huge site wants to be built.	Noted. Planning for future development needs is an ongoing process and will not stop at 2031.Sites are allocated on the basis of their environmental and infrastructure capacity.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21677E	Mark Filler				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	The phasing appears front end loaded, how can a community be sustained throughout the plan period if no new homes are planned for the majority of the period under consideration?	The phasing period gives an indication of when development can commence. The reason for delaying sites until later in the plan period are for reasons such as infrastructure requirements and there being multiple sites allocated in the plan period. When development actually starts is market led.	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Barnham, Honington and Sapiston should be removed from the excluded sites list	Sites have not been allocated in these locations as they are designated as infill villages.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 6: Housing Settlement Boundaries (RV2)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 6a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?	Question 6b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes	More local meetings to inform of these boundary lines	Consultation with local communities has taken place in accordance with government guidelines and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no	The existing settlement boundary for Shepherds Grove Park mobile home park should be retained.	Agree. There are other policies elsewhere in the Local Plan which control development in this location.	Re-introduce the housing settlement boundary at Shepherd's Grove Mobile Home Park.
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no	The scale of the proposed development adjacent to the A143 at Great Barton is too great. It will not only cause Great Barton to lose its separate rural identity, but also cause huge traffic chaos on the approaches to Bury, not to mention pressure on local services.	The traffic impacts of growth in this location will need to be assessed and appropriate action taken accordingly.	The need for a transport statement and safety audit is set out in the supporting text to the Great Barton policy.
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptekeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes	but the local planning authority needs to have the ability to respond to a structured development plan from that local community or Parish Council to address local needs.	Parishes have the opportunity to do this through the Neighbourhood Plan process	None
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no	No. I feel in the case of Wickhambrook 50% short term, 25% medium term and 25% long term.	The phasing of the site at Wickhambrook will need to occur in one period to ensure the delivery of the site	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no	The need for phasing of development is understood, however in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council also needs to give due consideration to the need to maintain competition for market land over the plan period. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF sets out the Councils should identify and update a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Taking into account the NPPF, the Council needs to give consideration to bringing forward the timescale for the phasing of some developments. Within the Main Towns and Key Service centres, this should include ensuring that at least two sites are available to come forward for development earlier on in the plan period. Specific reference of this with regard to Barrow is set out in more detail under question 23.	Phasing is determined through an assessment of such issues as site constraints, infrastructure requirements and overall growth in the vicinity. The phasing for individual sites is dealt with in the individual village sections.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				The Council also needs to give due consideration to the benefits created by bringing the timescale for the delivery of development forward. This includes the early provision of affordable housing to meet the identified shortfall and delivery of services and infrastructure to support local communities. In specific relation to Barrow, this could include delivery of a Dental Surgery and improved pedestrian links to the village from the development. This point is elaborated on in more detail under question 23.	See above	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	However we are concerned, given the amount of growth planned, that the appropriate infrastructure should be in place before development commences and not after eg roads and facilities THEN houses. St Eds must give careful thought to the inevitable impact of the rural plan on all villages in order to ensure that village appeal and life is not destroyed. There is general concern over the potential size of the proposed growth in housing is there demand? is there employment? will the infrastructure cope?	The three Infrastructure Delivery Plans, which accompany the Vision documents, set out how the infrastructure requirements will be met.	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	If the current appeal for 101 houses in Stanton is allowed there will be very short term development but no medium or long term development, if the appeal is dismissed there will be no development at all in the plan period.	The appeal was allowed in May 2012. Other opportunities for development may come forward in the plan period within the settlement boundary	Changes have been made to Stanton village section to reflect the appeal decision

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	If there is a need for additional housing and a willing developer, then all land allocated should be able to be brought forward for development as required. For instance, in Clare, it is unreasonable for three sites to be allocated and only one being capable of development pre-2021. The unreasonableness of this approach is emphasised by the fact that there is no restriction on the delivery of equally sized development sites falling within the defined Village Framework which are no longer identified as allocations as such	This question asks whether the phasing periods provide enough flexibility. Sites can come forward within the village envelope at any time and not subject to phasing restrictions. The phasing for individual sites is dealt with in the individual village sections.	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	It is likely that there will be a negative impact on commercial housing development in Clare if the proposed wind farm applications are accepted. The turbines as currently proposed are within 1 mile of the sites RV7a and RV7b and their proximity will be a material consideration for house purchasers. Developments post 2021 may therefore not take place.	This question asks whether the phasing periods provide enough flexibility. The phasing for individual sites is dealt with in the individual village sections.	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no	We do not agree that explicit reference should be made to 'short term' sites being phased 'after plan adoption'. Notwithstanding the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the requirement to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, remains. Reference to the phasing of short term site being phased 'beyond the adoption of the plan', is therefore superfluous. By way of background, in 2010, many of the short term sites were identified as being phased in the period beyond 2011 within the Preferred Options version of the Rural Site Allocations DPD. The Council subsequently took the decision to effectively 're-brand' the Rural Site Allocations DPD as the Rural Vision 2031, with the current consultation document effectively being a further Preferred Options version of the Rural Site Allocations DPD. As such two years have lost .	The statement 'after plan adoption' is made for clarity. Planning applications on the sites within the rural vision submitted before the plan is adopted may be considered premature.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)		Nothing has changed since 2010 in terms of housing being needed in St Edmundsbury. In fact, the need for this housing can only have grown more acute. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making, this means that 'Local Planning Authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area'. To explicitly refer to the phasing of the short term sites after plan adoption is considered to be contrary to this approach. This is particularly the case when the reiteration of the Rural Site Allocations DPD as the Rural Vision 2031 has effectively delayed the plan-making process for two years. Removal of 'after adoption of the plan', would remove an unnecessary policy barrier to appropriate early planning applications.	See above	No changes required
	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)		Such instances might involve situations where although the soundness of the plan has not been examined in public, the local community is supportive of the proposal. Favourable consideration of such proposal would be consistent with the localism agenda. We therefore suggest that short term sites are defined as being those where development is a priority in the period to 2021.	The local community can bring forward a neighbourhood plan outside of the Local Plan process.	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Additionally, the local Planning authority must consider locally derived schemes which satisfies and goes beyond the minimum requirement for a designated village that has the ability to benefit the local community.	Noted. Schemes which go beyond the requirement in the Local Plan can be brought forward through neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	The proposal for a Nursing home to be provided on a brownfield site within the Nowton Court complex should be included as a key site within the Nowton Court Continuing Care Retirement Community supporting care in the community and particularly for the residents of the urban area of Bury St Edmonds surrounded by Nowton Park.	A nursing home in this location could be dealt with via a planning application rather than a formal allocation in the Vision 2031 document	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	Yes, the periods now relate to a more realistic interpretation of build rates and allow greater flexibility for market fluctuations. The phasing periods are in general conformity with NPPF guidance. We do not agree to the specific number of units for Risby (20) up to 2021 but this will be more appropriately set out in relation to question 43.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society agrees in principle with the phasing period, but believes these should be capable of review and revision as part of any Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that community aspirations are capable of influencing phasing to meet local evidence-based needs identified as part of the plan process.	The preparation of a neighbourhood plan could influence the phasing of a development site within the rural vision.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	I think the medium term timeframe may need to be foreshortened.	Specific dates have been removed to introduce more flexibility. This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	The infrastructure struggles today to support the existing population of Barrow.	The three Infrastructure Delivery Plans, which accompany the Vision documents, set out how the infrastructure requirements will be met.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Would non delivery of economic development affect progress? How is it to be measured What would constitute failure?	The delivery of housing within the phasing periods is subject to market forces over which the council has no control.	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We are unable to agree any phasing until the Core Strategy is revisited and housing numbers moderated. We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. This review should be linked to those of Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment to make on this issue at this time.	Noted	None
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for respondi	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no	Totally disagree with RV7b proposal for Clare as site should not be developed. It has been recognised as an "Important Space" and "Conservation Land" within the Conservation Area Boundary several times already from the 1980s and even as recently as a few years ago, by you, and nothing has changed.	This site is not being included as an allocation due to the objections received.	Site is no longer included as an allocation.
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Yes, but only if the planning authority prevents the advancement of its medium term start dates.	The phasing periods are there to ensure a steady supply of land over the plan period.	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			no	Not as detailed. See response to Question 40.	Agree that phasing for the delivery of the Hopton site needs to be more flexible to allow for the individual requirements of the site.	The phasing period of 'medium term' has been removed for Hopton to allow development to occur at any time within the plan period.
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	With respect to Barrow, I note that development of sites 2 and 3 is proposed for after 2021 (which seems a bit restrictive) but I understand that the demand for new housing exists now, and I feel the success or otherwise of the development is not dependent on delaying it until after 2021 but in ensuring that the necessary accompanying service and infrastructure reinforcements/improvements are carried out.	The phasing periods are there to ensure a steady supply of land over the plan period. Infrastructure requirements are dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21430E	Michael Hendry	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited	C/O Agent	no	The reference to the phased delivery of sites is unhelpful and should be removed. It is or the market and the developers to deliver development and the setting of arbitrary phasing is restrictive and prevents the delivery of sustainable site; as such the reference should be deleted.	The phasing periods are indicative and are there to ensure a steady supply of land over the plan period. Phasing is determined through an assessment of such issues as site constraints, infrastructure requirements and overall growth in the vicinity	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no	Risby does not need more housing in short term, extra housing having recently been built.	Noted. The allocation in Risby is based on the infrastructure and environmental capacity of the village and its designation as a Local Service Centre.	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no	Risby Parish Council is happy with the phasing periods but NOT with the fact that the site allocated for development in Risby has now been switched from medium (after 2021), as set out in paragraph 7.11.4 of the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document, to short term. The village does not need new development in the short term as it has had new development on the Hanbury Paddocks site.	The phasing for individual sites is dealt with in the individual village sections. The phasing for this site has been moved to medium term as the pre-school has already been delivered so there is no urgency in bringing the site forward.	Amend phasing in Risby section to medium term
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	It seems sensible to phase in the development	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21617E	A Williamott				no	With specific reference to RV12 Cavendish - Recent low cost homes remain unsold indicating no need therefore proposed short term development if required should be moved to medium term.	This question asks whether the phasing periods provide enough flexibility. The phasing for individual sites is dealt with in the individual village sections. The actual delivery of sites will be market led.	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	We have already been told but a representative from the council that 2021 is not a true date. It is what bury council would like to see but if the builders get what they want it can start as soon as. This is false hope to people to think they will be safe until then. Also 29 properties was proposed for the centre of barrow which is enough for us to cope with but that has already increased to 40. If that has happened there I fear what will happen if the 150 gets approved we will be swamped losing our identity and most probably opening the flood gates for more.	The phasing allows for the majority of the development to start in the short/medium term. When this actually occurs will be down to market forces.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	The phasing appears front end loaded, how can a community be sustained throughout the plan period if no new homes are planned for the majority of the period under consideration?	The phasing is indicative and allows for the majority of the development to start in the short/medium term. When this actually occurs will be down to market forces.	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Principle of phasing is fine, but the individual villages need to be reassess, the principle of setting a new vision must be to reassess all designations such as housing settlement boundaries	All settlements have had their boundaries assessed as part of the Rural Vision process and amendments made where necessary	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				no opinion	Not sure	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	Regarding the sites in Great Barton itself, there will need to be access into the new development from Mill Road.	Noted. The site access will be from Mill Road.	Site access amended to show from Mill Road
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 7: Phasing of Development Sites

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 7a - Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?	Question 7b - Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve					the local Planning authority must consider locally derived schemes	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	Yes as long as the housing is not seen in isolation and that any necessary infrastructure accompanies the housing development in an integrated way.	Noted. Infrastructure requirements are dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15667	Matthew Hancock MP					I agree with the 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	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				Delivery The document, at the front end, takes the form of a community strategy for the two areas and in the last part, takes the form of a Sties Specifics DPD or AAP. Whilst broadly agreeing with the aspirations and actions in the first part, which seem logical and worthwhile, there is no indication of implementation such as time scales and responsible organisations. It is unclear how these actions will be delivered and their success monitored. Taking the document as a DPD, the Council notices that there is a lack of delivery, monitoring and implementation for the pure DPD element of the document. Although this is a Preferred Options version, the Council would have expected an outline of how the proposals will be delivered and how policy implementation will be monitored to be included at this stage in preparation of the DPD.	Noted the support for the actions and aspirations. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan and monitoring appendix	Include monitoring appendix.
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	While the aspiration to provide support for homes and communities by diversifying the use of existing facilities is welcomed the Council must acknowledge in its proposed actions that vacant building create an opportunity for misuse. The actions should include the encouragement of the re-use of redundant buildings to help prevent their misuse and deterioration. The Council must also accept that in some instances the conversion of non-viable community facilities to other uses might be the only option.	Agree. This links with the Council's work around ensuring empty homes are brought back into use.	Aspiration amended to include empty homes and buildings
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	We would support aspiration 2 & 3 (can't identify aspiration 1 in booklet)	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januays Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	How will this be achieved under existing legislation?	The Vision document is a long term plan which will require close working with partner organisations.	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes	No. We consider that more than 1,600 homes can be accommodated in a sustainable way, within the Rural Area in the period to 2031. The council's Included Sites Schedule projects that 641 dwellings will be completed on brownfield sites in Bury St Edmunds in the next 5 years. On greenfield sites at Bury St Edmunds, a figure of 650 dwellings is identified. We consider that this rate of delivery is over-estimated. Owing to the nature of those sites, development will take longer to come forward than the Council anticipate. A more realistic figure might be in the order of 800-900 dwellings across brownfield and greenfield sites at Bury St Edmunds. To compensate for this slower delivery of housing at Bury St Edmunds, we believe that the Rural Area can play a greater role in the early delivery of housing across the Borough. These circumstances have been exacerbated by a slowing of delivery since the Adoption of the Core Strategy in 2010.	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)		This approach would accord with the NPPF, which explains that the presumption in favour of sustainable development means that Local Plans should provide sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	Based upon the answers to the questions above insufficient vision and provision has been provided for the elderly sector of the Borough for the Plan period where there needs to be allocations of specialist and related accommodation and where this provision is not generally part of the market housing or Affordable housing allocations identified by the Borough in its Plans. Given the size of the elderly sector the Borough should be working with the private sector in identifying appropriate allocations within the Plan.	Noted. Agree that a new action could be added to address housing provision for the elderly.	Amended an existing action to include reference to meeting the housing provision needs. Action 1k
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	We welcome the flexible use of public sector buildings, village halls, school halls, etc to engender a public collective and encourage locally available cultural and leisure facilities.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society supports the general aspirations but believes that greater support should be given to supporting community initiatives to directly deliver affordable housing including community land trusts and community right to build initiatives.	Noted. The Council considers that this issue is addressed in Aspiration 1 and the subsequent actions	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes	Aspiration 1 It is important to emphasise the need for consultation with the communities. This is particularly relevant to the statements made in Paragraphs 9.34 to 9.38 This links to Q5 Objective 5 for which it is essential that an objective need is established before any sites are considered for Gypsy & Traveller Sites	Noted. The Council considers that this issue is addressed in Aspiration 1 and the subsequent actions	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Demand should come before supply.	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
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Community schemes to enable bulk purchase of goods and services to help reduce costs Support from developers to ensure residents views heard/supported Contradiction - downsize rather than assist with improvements i.e. single elderly require support to heat homes	The comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15930	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				In relation to the constraints and opportunities for rural development, your Water Cycle Study should be referred to in order to ascertain the environmental capacity of individual settlements. This is particularly in relation to water quality issues arising as a result of the discharge of increased volumes of treated water effluent.	The need to make reference to water capacity issues is recognised.	Water capacity issues are addressed in the relevant village sections.
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council welcomes the commitment to meeting the specialist housing needs of older people, and we will continue to work with the borough council as per 9.5 k). 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.	Agree that reference should be made to 'older <i>and vulnerable</i> people. Lifetime homes policy is included within the Development Management Policies document.	Change reference in this section and throughout the aspirations and action section of this document.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no	Again totally disagree with the Clare proposal RV7b	Site RV7b has been removed from the document due to issues raised in objections received.	Site RV7b has been deleted
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	Very laudable sentiments, however I have major reservations if most of these will ever be achieved. working in Local Government I know how constrained the financial positions are.	The Vision document is a long term plan which will require close working with partner organisations.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	If community developments keep pace with housing developments; there has been evidence of that until now.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	Couldn't find aspiration 1; in aspiration 3, I think measures to tackle fuel poverty need to be more muscular if they are to be effective: e.g. encourage/negotiate mains gas, investigate feasibility of community combined heat and power schemes.	Noted - suggest that this detail is included in the Delivery Plan	None at this stage but include in Delivery Plan
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	<p>Risby Parish Council agrees with your aspirations, but not with all the proposals to achieve them.</p> <p>The wording in the proposed actions is too vague. Words like encourage and enable improve do not really mean anything. Specific, measurable actions are needed to improve rural life. How will these aspirations be achieved? What steps will the Borough Council take? Most importantly most of the actions require an injection of money which is not available. Villages need more concrete support to improve rural life. Again the issue is also a lack of volunteers. It is getting increasingly more difficult to find enough volunteers. People lead busy lives working or with families. Older residents do not necessarily want to commit large amounts of time either.</p>	Noted - suggest that this detail is included in the Delivery Plan	None at this stage but include in Delivery Plan

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Some of the proposals to achieve these aspirations are not detailed enough. The actions should list clear, realistic and achievable steps and details of how they will be funded.</p> <p>Small villages experience the following problems: Lack of services Lack of willing volunteers Insufficient money Lack of expertise and people willing to take on new projects due to work or time commitments</p> <p>Examples: Stradishall does not even have a village hall. In villages without a village hall, could efforts be made to use churches as used to be the case in the past? For this to happen though, toilets and kitchens would need to be provided and more efficient heating. Ousden has a village hall which is full of asbestos and which is in urgent need of repair. This is not possible due to the asbestos. Several years ago they were quoted £50,000 to take it down, before even starting on a new building. You cannot get a grant for a new building unless you can prove usage and this is very difficult in small villages.</p>	Noted - suggest that this detail is included in the Delivery Plan	None at this stage but include in Delivery Plan

Rural Vision 2031

Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>It is a catch 22 as it is difficult to rent cold draughty village halls and so it is not always possible to predict usage. Villages need a massive injection of funding to help overcome these difficulties.</p> <p>Small villages struggle to get enough volunteers to join village organisations already. It will be very difficult to get volunteers and generate enthusiasm for new projects. In a lot of villages the workload falls on a few willing volunteers.</p> <p>Small villages have small precepts and so cannot access large sums of money. Grants may be available to meet some of the costs, but small villages need more financial support. Small parish councils have annual precepts of around £5,000 and small reserves.</p>	Noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>Lidgate does not have any play facilities for children. The Parish Council would like to build a new play park, but again the cost is prohibitive without a large injection of money. Researching and applying for funding is time consuming and small villages need more help to do this.</p> <p>Maintaining play parks is costly and can be a big drain on resources, especially for ones with bark chipping which are expensive to maintain. The Borough Council provides play facilities in towns, why can't this be extended to rural communities as well?</p>	In most of the rural parts of the Borough the Borough Council is not the predominant owner of the amenity land, the Parish Councils are. The Borough Councils Ownership of the land on which the Town's play facilities are located pre-dates the formation of the Town Councils. The Borough Council helps support the Parish's in the management of their Play areas by undertaking, safety inspections. The Borough Council also provides Parish Councils with grants to help towards the cost of playground facilities.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	Yes, but how many empty homes are there in the borough ? Fuel Poverty is a growing issue in the rural areas, where residents are reliant on the fluctuating price of heating oil.	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	People in barrow are already happy with the size the village is It woks with regards to services and schools When you propose in increase a village so drastically as your vision the sense of community will be lost it is a housing estate being latched on not integrating a community.	Noted. The allocations in Barrow are based on the Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity of the village and its designation as a Key Service Centre.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes	Please ensure that there is a feeling of fairness when it comes to consultation over traveller sites. The local considerations need to be taken into account and not ignored at a later date	The provision of gypsy and traveller sites is based on a needs assessment	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 8: Homes and Communities aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 8a - Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?	Question 8b - Do you agree with the actions we proposed to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15720	Iain Wardrop	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited	no	In Chapter 10 Jobs & Economy the focus is to encourage more economic development and jobs in rural areas. The Vision hopes rural St Edmundsbury will be a place where villages have local jobs and are not simply dormitories. To achieve this proposal actions include 'safeguard existing important rural employment sites'. It is therefore contended that rezoning employment land adjacent to an existing major employer runs counter to the key aim of encouraging sustainable employment opportunities in rural areas as it does not encourage future business investment. Indeed by taking away potential expansion space, the operation of the existing VION facility may well be prejudiced.	The reduction of the area for the Great Wratting general Employment Area reflects the changes which have occurred in the operation of the site since 2006, but maintains the potential for redevelopment and expansion of current facilities. It will have no strategic impact on overall employment land supply and will not conflict with the overall aims to provide employment opportunities to meet the needs of the rural community.	No changes required
	Iain Wardrop	Ryden	Alasdair Cox	VION Food Group Limited		Therefore in response to the Vision's Question 9, as VION is keen to see existing rural employment safeguarded, it is important to retain fully those employment land allocations as specified in the current Local Plan. This response links to our submission on the loss of employment land at Great Wratting attached at the end of this questionnaire.	The rural vision has reassessed the employment requirements in the rural area to 2031 and made adjustments accordingly.	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology			no	Barnham Camp is a Scheduled Monument of National Importance (DSF 15353; HER no. BHN 054). Any development within this area will, therefore, require Scheduled Monument Consent. Early discussions with English Heritage will, therefore, be required. The second (lower) site on Inset 8 is the site of a World War I and II mustard gas station (HER no. BNH 063). No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	These comments are noted.	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes	the allocation of Barrow Business Park will be supported by the new residential allocations. In order to encourage businesses to locate in the Business Park consideration should be given to the early delivery of housing on land to the east of Barrow Hill, to deliver an increase in population required to support local businesses.	The phasing of allocations is dealt with in the relevant village sections. No change required to policy RV3	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion	Employment issues in Horringer, an infill village, are likely to be minimal, however, we do have concerns about the increased traffic issues, being located on the A143 between Bury and Haverhill, especially relating to delivery vehicles.	The council acknowledges the concerns about increased traffic on rural roads in aspiration 4 of the travel section.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Shepherds Grove, the access road has always followed the old perimeter track, now much of this has gone the line across the airfield could be realigned to take it further from housing in Hepworth and make it a more attractive layout for developers.	This is a matter which could be addressed at masterplan/design brief stage.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	In Clare, the 0.5 ha allocation for business purposes in the site at Nethergate Street is far too small in relation to the proposed additional 199 dwellings in the village. Sites need to be larger to adequately provide the employment opportunities to prevent outward migration in search of employment. The employment allocation in Clare, in relation to proposed housing growth, does not match Rural Objective No.2 which aims to 'maintain and develop the rural economic base through, the provision of rural employment sites'. The land at Bridewell Industrial Estate in Clare is already developed for employment purposes and is within the Village Framework and so there is no need whatsoever for this land to be noted as an Employment Allocation.	The number of dwellings allocated in the village has been reduced and it is considered 0.5ha of employment space is appropriate. This 0.5 will be provided on the Chilton Street site due to the removal of the Clare Nethergate Street housing and employment allocation. Bridewell Industrial Estate allocation remains to ensure that employment uses are maintained on the site.	Allocation of 0.5ha of land at Clare Chilton Street as rural employment area.
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	But encouragement should also be given to small scale rural business enterprises outside of the designated employment areas to reduce commuting time/traffic density for those in employment and to encourage viability and vibrancy over the whole of the rural area within the Borough.	Encouragement is given to small scale rural employment through the jobs and economy aspirations and actions	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15830	Mr Richard Tilley	CgMs Ltd		Elveden Farms Ltd	no	<p>We endorse the strategy set out in Para 10.6 of the Rural Vision document of giving support to well established general employment areas in rural parts of the district. This is essential to underpin the objective set out on Para 10.4 of creating more local jobs.</p> <p>However we do not consider that policy RV3 as drafted will be effective in achieving this objective, because it only gives support to a limited number of larger employment sites. Thus although the policy recognises the role of the Gorse Industrial estate at Barnham, and encourages additional employment development there, no such support is given to smaller long-established employment sites such as the Little Heath Industrial Estate at Barnham. The latter site is located a similar distance from Barnham Village as the main part of the Gorse estate, and has a long history of industrial and other employment uses (tank museum).</p>	The site referred to is a single employment use in the countryside and would not be appropriate for allocation as general employment as it is not situated in or adjacent to a Key or Local Service Centre.	No changes required
	Mr Richard Tilley	CgMs Ltd		Elveden Farms Ltd		<p>We consider that policy RV3 should be amended to support the development of additional employment uses at existing smaller established employment sites by adding the term 'other existing employment sites' to the policy so that it reads as follows:</p> <p>'Proposals for B1, and B2 and B8 uses where appropriate, will be permitted within general employment areas and other existing employment sites providing that space requirements, parking, access and general environmental considerations can be met'.</p>	The approach in the Rural Vision accords with national policy in trying to create sustainable communities. The employment sites allocated in the Vision document are considered sufficient to meet the needs of the rural area.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	Provision of accommodation for the elderly in specialist and related accommodation, including Nursing homes, provides a high level of employment provision. This has not been taken into account by the Borough and without specific allocations being made the Borough has not addressed the needs and requirements for the Care sector which would give rise to this substantial employment provision.	Applications for specialist residential facilities for the elderly can be dealt with on a case by case basis.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	We would suggest that rural diversification should include simplified planning procedures for home working, sympathetic re-use of redundant buildings and a presumption in favour of the relaxation of extant permissions which unreasonably limit occupancy of rural buildings for permanent residence.	These issues are dealt with in the Joint Development Management document.	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Encourage small scale rural business to reduce the need for travel	Encouragement is given to small scale rural employment through the jobs and economy aspirations and actions	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	Draft Policy RV3 is generally supported by the Society but believes that B8 should be discouraged as a lower value employment. B8 is an extensive use that generates disproportionately fewer jobs than B1 or B2 uses. Furthermore, encouraging HGV trips from sites removed from the trunk road network is inherently unsustainable and should be discouraged. The Society recommends that B8 references be deleted. The Society objects to this element of the policy.	Whereas B8 uses are often lower value with less employment opportunities, they still have an important role to play in rural economies. Some sites, such as Saxham are well located with direct access to the primary and trunk road network. Other sites, such as Stanton and Chedburgh have an important role to play in providing lower value, high floorspace requirements and other B8 uses may be essential to support rural enterprises. Rather than remove reference to B8 uses on all rural sites, it would be more appropriate to consider the nature and impact of the B8 uses proposed at planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	3	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	The Rural Vision 2031 DPD provides a new policy on rural employment areas, which carries forward the strategy set out in the Replacement Local Plan 2016 'to continue to support the already well-established general employment areas in the rural parts of the Borough. Within these areas, the Council has reviewed the potential amount of land available for development and Policy RV3, which designates the 'Rural Employment Areas', also includes a list of the land available for development. This list includes 53.1ha of land at Shepherd's Grove, Stanton/Hepworth for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Although this area is not identified on the Proposals Map Inset Plan 48, it is clear that the majority of this land falls within the site that was the subject of a planning permission in July 2006 for an 'IKEA' distribution warehouse.	The potential high cost of providing the infrastructure required for the development of this site is acknowledged, but is necessary for the delivery of this large site. However, details of how this may be delivered, whether in a single provision, or a phased delivery will need to be the subject of further, detailed analysis. This would include discussion around viability. As has been alluded to in the observation, the highway requirements are based upon a scheme approved for the delivery of a specific proposal, which was considered economically viable. A future alternative proposal may prove economically viable.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		The red dashed line on the plan indicates the infrastructure required to serve any new development at the site (as defined in the policy) in this case, a new 'four-arm' roundabout just south of the A143, together with new access roads that would serve both existing industrial estates at Shepherd's Grove East and Shepherd's Grove West. This infrastructure is identical to the proposals contained in the IKEA planning application, which was approved in July 2006 but has now expired. Such infrastructure works will be expensive. Carisbrooke Investments have obtained detailed cost estimates for these works (see separate report on off-site infrastructure works by Davis Langdon), and they are summarised below:	If not, then the viability discussion may take place based upon the economic position pertaining. It is not for the policy to pre-judge such matters.	No changes required
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		<p>i) New access roundabout, highway works, sewers, utilities etc. - £3,041,602</p> <p>ii) New access roads (1,600m in length), footpath/cycleways, streetlighting, foul & surface water drainage, services and utilities (without connection costs) - £3,200,000.</p> <p>Therefore, an indicative total construction (excluding professional fees, finance and disbursements) is likely to be in the region of £6.24 million.</p> <p>It should also be borne in mind that these works could not realistically be phased over a long period (in order to spread costs) during the development of the site, since the new access to Shepherd's Grove West would form an important element of the desired planning gain and would be required as soon as possible to alleviate the current access problems.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		As currently worded, Policy RV3 indicates that major infrastructure works are required for developable land in only two rural employment areas - Chedburgh and Shepherd's Grove. In reality, this is not really the case as the planning application that was approved for the residential redevelopment of the former Firework Factory Site in Chedburgh, includes a new access road to the existing northern industrial area. The proposed access was shown on the Inset Map for Chedburgh in the Replacement Local Plan, but is not shown on the proposals map inset plan for the Rural Vision 2031 DPD.	See above	No changes required
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		Policy RV3 should therefore be amended to recognise that the infrastructure required to serve the existing northern industrial area in Chedburgh (the new access road), will already be provided through the residential redevelopment of the adjacent site. Accordingly, the only rural employment area listed within Policy RV3 that requires major infrastructure as part of any new development proposals is the Shepherd's Grove Employment Area. It is requested therefore, that the policy should be amended to indicate this fact and that, in recognition of the importance of the Shepherd's Grove Employment Area in meeting Rural Objectives 2, 3 and 4, the text of the policy should also reflect that the Council would be willing to consider the inclusion of higher value uses to help cross-subsidise the very high infrastructure costs associated with the development of the site.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		<p>Our proposed revisions to the wording for the final paragraphs of Policy RV3 are set out below:</p> <p>Proposals for B1, B2 and B8 uses where appropriate, will be permitted within general employment areas providing that space requirements, parking, access and general environmental considerations can be met.</p> <p>Shepherd's Grove, Stanton/Hepworth - Infrastructure delivery/Development viability:</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the infrastructure costs associated with the provision of a new roundabout on the A143 and new access roads, to serve both existing industrial estates and major new commercial development, could have a potential impact upon deliverability of the developable part of the site for employment purposes.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		<p>If, having regard to prevailing market conditions, it can be demonstrated that such costs will seriously jeopardise the delivery of the site, and the provision of the required infrastructure, the Local Planning Authority will consider the inclusion of an appropriate provision of higher value uses to cross-subsidise these costs. The amount, location and nature of such uses shall be identified in a development brief for the site and shall be subject to regular review, having regard to market conditions and development viability. 7</p> <p>The route of the new access roads and roundabout are identified on the Proposals Map and will be safeguarded. A Masterplan or Development Brief will be required for the site at Clare, Nethergate Street.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		There are clear and justifiable reasons for adopting a more specific policy approach to the development of the Shepherd's Grove Employment Area. Firstly, Shepherd's Grove is the only rural employment area specified within Policy RV3 that requires the provision of significant infrastructure works before the undeveloped areas of the site can be developed. Secondly, the costs of the required infrastructure and the likelihood that most of the works would be required as a first phase of any development (i.e. before any returns could help fund it), is such that an innovative, proactive policy needs to be adopted suggesting how this infrastructure could be provided. Thirdly, the size, scale and importance of the Shepherd's Grove site and therefore its likely contribution to rural employment needs (it represents nearly 90% of the total area available for the rural areas), suggests that development of the site forms a key element of the Council's aspirations for the Rural Vision 2031 DPD.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd		Fourthly, as already discussed, there is a clear and pressing need to resolve traffic/access issues to the existing industrial estates at Shepherd's Grove and the accident black-spot on A143. There is also clear local support from both Parishes to resolve these problems. Finally, the revised approach suggested in the re-wording of Policy RV3 set out above, is a method that has been used by the Council before (at the Haverhill Research Park) with the inclusion of 'higher value uses' being justified as an exception to normal policy because of the high costs of infrastructure and services provision.	See above	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	I am surprised that the Rougham Industrial Estate is not included, nor are any reasons given for its exclusion.	This site is considered within the Bury Vision document as part of Suffolk Business Park extension	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	What employment areas? There is already mass unemployment in towns and cities. Rural employment no longer exists.	There are a number of rural employment sites and less formal employment opportunities in the rural areas.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Safeguard existing improvement of rural employment sites how? KSC adjoining major road routes easy access away from village Need to serve local employment and not develop out of keeping with community /environment/village size Protect existing services from larger businesses with no history of support within village Public Houses remain viable brewers not just 'writing off' assets for example	The council seeks to safeguard important existing sites for employment use and encourage local jobs in rural areas.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	existing improvement of rural employment sites how?	The council seeks to safeguard important existing sites for employment use.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Regarding RV3e), Barnham Camp is a Scheduled Monument of National Importance (DSF 15353; HER no. BHN 054). Any development within this area will, therefore, require Scheduled Monument Consent. Early discussions with English Heritage will, therefore, be required. The second (lower) site on Inset 8 is the site of a World War I and II mustard gas station (HER no. BNH 063). No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Regarding sites a), b), g), h), j) and k), the county council has no objection to development on historic environment grounds, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Development at any of these locations will require appropriate levels of transport assessment and travel planning.	Noted. These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	The existing business across the district are not at 100% occupancy or with a waiting list. Before building more industrial/business units it would make more sense to upgrade those we already have and try to increase occupancy levels. As we are now in a shared Services agreement with FHDC, use some of their spare capacity before building in the Rural Villages. I would want to see cast iron proof of the need for more units and not just some Local Politicians whim.	With the exception of Ixworth, all of the sites identified are existing allocations carried forward. The new site at Ixworth is identified to satisfy a local need for employment opportunities. Improving the economic sustainability of the rural areas will require a combination of using existing sites efficiently, bringing disused or underused buildings back into use and making provision for new buildings.	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	i would like to see a designated employment area in Kedington.	There is no requirement for an employment area in Kedington due to the close proximity of the Wratting Rural Employment Area and other employment opportunities in Haverhill	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21422E	Michael Hendry	Bidwells		S W Cross and Sons	no	While the allocation of 1.6 hectares of employment land west of the Bardwell Road, Ixworth is welcomed, my client objects to the restriction of the use class to B1. The restriction of employment use to B1 ought to be relaxed to allow small-scale B8 storage and distribution with limitations on the size of vehicles and opening hours imposed by conditions at a later stage to ensure the residential amenity of nearby properties. D1 uses of the site ought also to be permitted in the interest of providing an area for employment generating community facilities, such as dentists, if required. The flexibility is sought to ensure maximum uptake of the employment allocation.	The particular need in Ixworth is for B1 business uses, as existing employment opportunities within this Key service centre are restricted. B8 use is less likely to deliver the ratio of employment opportunities to floorspace which is required. Existing D1 uses are already accommodated within the village, but should a requirement for further provision be identified, which cannot be accommodated, then consideration could be given to the use of this site. However, without such evidence, it would be inappropriate to include such uses within the allocation.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21430E	Michael Hendry	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited	C/O Agent	no	While the allocation of 0.5 hectares of employment land at Nethergate Street (RV3 (c) is welcomed, my client objects to the restriction of the use class to B1. The restriction of employment use to B1 ought to be relaxed to allow small-scale B8 storage and distribution with limitations on the size of vehicles and opening hours imposed by conditions at a later stage to ensure the residential amenity of nearby properties. D1, A1 and A2 uses of the site ought also to be permitted in the interest of providing an area for employment generating community facilities, such as dentists, if required and retail. The flexibility is sought to ensure maximum uptake of the employment allocation.	The particular need in Clare is for B1 business uses, as existing employment opportunities within this Key service centre are restricted. B8 use is less likely to deliver the ratio of employment opportunities to floorspace which is required. Existing D1 uses are already accommodated within the village, but should a requirement for further provision be identified, which cannot be accommodated, then consideration could be given to the use of this site. However, without such evidence, it would be inappropriate to include such uses within the allocation.	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	Villages are already dormitories as residents are forced to commute to work. One proposed action is to encourage home working. How do you intend to achieve this? There needs to be a shift in attitude amongst employers to enable this	The action to encourage home working can only be achieved through partnership working around education of employers	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	The proposal to develop a business park in barrow to generate employment for increased properties means increased traffic. In today's busy lifestyle people will drive to work. The increased traffic through the village is frightening also we need to be aware that this is starting to build towards a small town not a unique village as people have chosen to live	The employment area in Barrow has been allocated to ensure there is a balance between housing and employment which makes a settlement more sustainable.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 9: Rural Employment Area (RV3)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 9a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?	Question 9b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes	But this should not mean that rural business development is restricted to these areas only	There are many other opportunities for rural employment outside of these allocations such as farm diversification schemes and rural tourism.	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	This is sensible providing the infrastructure can cope with increasing volumes of traffic	The infrastructure requirements for the rural areas are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Important though the 'special protection area' is, the Defence of the Realm is more important. So RAF Honington's ability to operate should not be subordinated to the needs of the SPA. Rather the other way round.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes	Special uses could be classified agricultural land desperately needed for food and will be critical to the growing population.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment to make on this policy at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				This policy should include reference to the Breckland Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as part of this site, along with part of the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), is located within the perimeter of Barnham Camp. It is noted that this amendment was identified in the Rural Vision 2031 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and we therefore recommend that the policy and supporting text are amended in line with the recommendations of the HRA.	Thank you for responding	Amend the policy and supporting text to include reference to the Breckland SAC
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 10: Protection of Special Uses (RV4)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 10a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?	Question 10b - Please set out any changes you would like to see	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes	Very broadband dependent	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15667	Matthew Hancock MP					Rural Vision should acknowledge and build support for the broad array of workplaces across the Borough. Jobs are not confined to the areas allocated for 'jobs'. While these allocations are important, jobs are increasingly based at home, or in the community among customers. This has an impact on the importance of broadband (which is mentioned) but also local transport infrastructure.	These issues are covered in aspiration 2 and the travel section	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				Jobs With the proposed joining of the 'Business Park' and 'Rougham Industrial Estate', employment should become easier to find, whether it is the work required will become apparent then. If there is the correct work, and the right housing created, this should mean that there will still be a place within the Parish for the younger generation. The improvement of the Broadband speeds is essential to local business thus improving job prospects. Our 'Vision' therefore is retention of the younger generation with the Parish thus maintaining a wide spectrum of age groups.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	Especially Broadband improvements. There is little scope for employment growth in Horringer	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	While it is important that broadband is improved in rural areas it is also important not to ignore other business opportunities that become available but which are not mentioned.	Noted - the Council considers that aspiration 1 and the actions to achieve it focus on a wide range of rural business opportunities. Aspiration 2 focuses on Broadband but not at the expense of other business opportunities	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes	Agreement with aims but not sure how they are to be achieved or what impact it will have on planning policy.	The Vision document is a long term plan which will require close working with partner organisations.	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Suggest strengthening commitment to developing tourism - this is particularly relevant to Clare and the need to settle the future of the Country Park. Suggest strengthening the commitment to upgrading the broadband infrastructure in Key Service and Local Service Centres.	Noted - both issues addressed in the aspirations and actions	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	Yes - but frustrated local business broadband users would question that improvements have been made to this service in rural areas. To encourage home-working, and to increase the competitiveness of rurally based businesses against their urban counterparts, a huge input in improving communications in rural areas is of paramount importance. It is of no use to rural businesses to be advised that upgrades are in hand for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, but the rural areas will remain unimproved.	Agreed - this issue is addressed by the fact that aspiration 2, action 'a' specifically mentions that the Council will continue to lobby for broadband improvements	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	We support the actions, but would ask SEBC to consider that individual development proposals cannot alone correct the public transport inadequacies in rural areas.	The Vision document is a long term plan which will require close working with partner organisations.	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Broadband needs to be improved	Agreed - this issue is addressed by the fact that aspiration 2, action 'a' specifically mentions that the Council will continue to lobby for broadband improvements	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The aspirations for jobs and improved infrastructure are laudable. However, the implementation strategy is weak and a greater policy link is required to ensure that jobs and homes are kept in balance. New homes should match tangible employment opportunities if the aspiration for villages to not be simple dormitories is to be met.	Employment allocations have been made in Key Service Centres which are the most sustainable locations for new growth.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	I support the IT aspirations but feel that there should be much more to the 'jobs & economy' aspirations than this.	Noted - no suggestions provided as to what else should be included in this aspiration	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes	Of course but housing will not improve the economy in the long term. The influx of new residents will have to find employment. Where??	Employment allocations have been made in Key Service Centres which are the most sustainable locations for new growth.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Enough employment and business premises should be provided for a modest growth in population, but not of the order contained in the Core Strategy. Provision of jobs and business premises beyond this is likely to attract people from outside the borough to fill the vacancies and this will place additional burden on housing and the general infrastructure.	Employment allocations have been made in Key Service Centres which are the most sustainable locations for new growth.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
		This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	See above
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			no opinion	St Edmundsbury, notably in its villages and the Brecks, has great potential for further growth as a tourist destination. Whilst the action outlined in 10.5 b) states the borough council's support for the development of tourist facilities, this action could perhaps be extended to state that the borough council will work with organisations such as Visit East Anglia to market rural St Edmundsbury as a tourist destination. We welcome the commitment to new technology and digital communications in aspiration 2.	Noted - key partners will be identified in the Delivery Plan	Noted - key partners will be identified in the Delivery Plan
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	Without viable Broadband forget para 10.13. Businesses drive homeworking NOT St Eds, so if there is a cost benefit astute businesses will soon take it up. To include home working in this document is a smoke screen that most people will be unaware of. You must be honest with the residents of St Eds and NOT include information that is not a viable option	Agreed that actions need amending	Amended paragraph 10.13a and deleted 10.13b and c
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Superfast broadband might assist; there is no evidence of it at present, where current speed is about 7kbps, a small fraction of the proposed 4Mbps, which will only be achieved if the providers are given financial incentives. By whom?	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Yes, but greater parking provision in new housing developments would facilitate some home-based businesses.	The government has withdrawn maximum parking standards and county parking standards are being reviewed but are not part of this document	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				Risby Parish Council agrees with the aspirations but not with the proposed actions. Encouraging more home working is a good aspiration but how will this be achieved? Employers need to be involved. How will this be achieved? What steps will be taken to change the working culture in favour of flexible and home working? With the high cost of fuel being able to work at home for some or part of the week could really help some families, but will employers be willing to change their working patterns? Is legislation required?	Agreed that actions need amending	Amended paragraph 10.13a and deleted 10.13b and c
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	Encouraging more home working is a good aspiration, but employers would need to support this.	Agreed	As per the response to 37 above, the actions in paragraph 10.13 have been amended.
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 11: Jobs and Economy aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 11a - Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?	Question 11b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	Not sure that farm diversification is the answer to preserving agricultural land. How about ensuring that farmers get a decent price for their produce and supporting them to that effect? Agriculture is still our biggest local industry in Suffolk.	The Council has no influence over the cost of produce.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15685	Mrs Frederick				no	<p>I would like to make some comments regarding the Rural Vision 2031 leaflet, see section named Themes, item 3, Travel, I quote</p> <p>a) People have access to jobs, education, shops, an other services by sustainable and affordable transport.</p> <p>At the moment Little Whelnetham has no public transport running through the village, there use to be a bus running on a Wednesday and Saturday, the nearest bus stop is in Sicklesmere which is operated by Chambers. The nearest shop is the Post Office in Sicklesmere and the nearest public house is the Rushbrook Arms.</p> <p>b) Villages are connected by safe and attractive networks of footpaths and cycle routes.</p>	<p>The council is continuing to lobby for the increased provision of public transport in the rural areas. Improved footpaths and cycleways are aspirations for many of the villages which is included in aspiration 2.</p>	No changes required
						<p>At the moment Great Whelnetham and Little Whelnetham are not connected to one another, if you want to walk to e.g. Great Whelnetham Community Centre, Sicklesmere Post Office or Rushbrook Arms you risk your life walking on the road because it is full of bends, has high hedges and speeding motorists, see link to Google maps http://maps.google.co.uk/maps?hl=en&tab=wl showing the route I would have to take to get to Great Whelnetham Community Centre from my property.</p> <p>Great Whelnetham and Sicklesmere have all the facilities, footpaths and street lighting, Little Whelnetham has none of these so please can we have a safe proper footpath linking Little Whelnetham to the A134, and safer cycle routes, the path next to the A134 is used by cyclist because it is safer than using the highway, maybe I would consider using my bike instead of the car.</p>	<p>Noted. The aspiration for the connection of Great and Little Whelnetham by a safe footpath will be mentioned in the village section</p>	<p>The aspiration for the connection of Great and Little Whelnetham by footpath will be mentioned in the village section</p>
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		<p>This support is welcomed</p>	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				<p>3.1 Cross boundary considerations - Thetford It is disappointing that Thetford is not acknowledged as a service provider for rural areas to the north of St Edmundsbury Borough and specifically in the context of proposals at Barningham, Bardwell, Hopton, Ingham and Ixworth. The nearest supermarkets for some areas to the north of the District are in Thetford (although some local and key service centres have shops of varying degree of scale). Similarly, the nearest Secondary Education offer for the north of St. Edmundsbury Borough is in Thetford.</p> <p>Aspiration two of section 11 could also refer to connection by cycle to nearby towns, as appropriate (e.g. Barnham to Thetford). Policy TH11 of the TAAP (currently awaiting Inspector's Report) highlights that through detailed design, the Loops could extend to Barnham in order to provide a cycle route for Barnham and Thetford residents who travel between the two areas. Indeed this request was originally made by a teacher who works in Thetford, but lives in Barnham as part of the Preferred Options consultation for the TAAP.</p>	Agree that reference should be made to Thetford as a service provider. Agree that additional text can be inserted into aspiration 11.	Amend Barningham, Bardwell, Hopton, Ingham and Ixworth village sections to insert a reference to Thetford as a service provider. Add a new paragraph (above 11.8) in the rural document to reference TAAP.
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				Under the duty to co-operate, as detailed in the Localism Act, there appears to be clear opportunities for cross boundary working on this issue which should be referred to in this section as an Action. Suggested wording could be 'work with neighbouring District and County Councils to promote links to villages or towns out of St Edmundsbury Borough, which provide services or employment for residents'. Reference could also be made to the Loops and cross boundary working as part of Aspiration 3 of section 18.	Agree that reference should be made to cross boundary working.	Add a new action to 11.8c
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	<p>Transport</p> <p>Improving public transport could benefit employment in the area. To reduce car journeys requires an efficient and reliable public transport system. In large towns and cities this becomes easier to install as the number of uses can make the system economically affordable. In more rural areas the financial viability of a route becomes very difficult to manage. Unless financial support is forth coming from St Eds we believe this will always be a difficult problem to solve. Public transport needs to be provided at the right times i.e. early mornings and late evenings a difficult product to supply.</p> <p>Speed control is also an issue in many villages. More support is needed from St Eds to combat the issue 'improve signage and law enforcement of speed limits' would all be welcomed.</p>	Noted - the issue of funding will need to be addressed in the delivery plan.	None - address as part of delivery plan.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council				With the development within and on the outskirts of Bury, we are particularly concerned over the impact of more traffic through the village. With the siting of a new Hospital to the West of Bury and the intended new housing in Westley, we are concerned that much more traffic will be coming through the village. We are concerned as to how this will affect the nature of the village and we are concerned about how St Eds intends to ensure that this traffic is handled in a sensible planned manner. Consideration needs to be given to the surrounding routes and how they may be developed or what type of road/traffic restrictions will be introduced. Footpaths 'These are essential for village life. In Horringer, we have been asking St Eds for help in maintaining footpaths on the very busy A 143, but without success. Accidents will happen if we have poor quality footpath maintenance.	Comprehensive traffic modelling for Bury is being undertaken to determine areas for action and what the solutions are. Set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	None - address as part of delivery plan.
	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council				They can also link villages and making walking safer. 'Within villages they are important to village life and local communications 'Development of cycle paths would be welcomed not only to make cycling safer (by keeping it away from vehicles) but also the use of cycles generally (environmentally mor friendly than vehicle use)	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	The creation of pavements within villages could be a condition/S106 requirement on any planning permission granted for further development. This may be a more successful way of ensuring improvements are incorporated.	This would urbanise the character of villages and could require the use of private land over which the council has no control	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Aspiration 4 does not fully recognise the problems of 40 ton HGV vehicles using the A1092 - significant danger to pedestrians, etc. Action should be taken to place weight restrictions on this road, especially as Haverhill industry is increased. Footpaths will need be upgraded if they are to be used on a daily basis by large numbers of people e.g. children journeying to school. Costs will be prohibitive for parish councils.	The issue of HGV vehicles using the A1092 is being looked at. No weight restriction can be placed as this is a public highway.	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			no	No - complete 'pie in the sky'. Construct bypasses? (the loss of more of the countryside) Encourage quiet country lanes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders; low level traffic at low speeds (where are they coming from? Construct some more?)	Comprehensive traffic modelling for Bury is being undertaken to determine areas for action and what the solutions are. Set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Travel aspirations are fine providing the infrastructure is suitable on the main arterial roads within the Borough and building development should not happen until those congested areas are resolved. These actions are applicable to St Edmundsbury Borough Council, Suffolk County Council and The Highways Agency.	Comprehensive traffic modelling for Bury is being undertaken to determine areas for action and what the solutions are. Set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	no	The provision of specialist Care accommodation on the edge of Bury St. Edmonds, such as at Nowton Court, can properly make use of the existing bus services, extended where appropriate, together with the provision of specialist travel vehicles operated by the Care Villages to facilitate appropriate connections to Bury St. Edmonds centre, the railway and bus station, etc. apart from normal visits. This would all be part of a beneficial travel plan.	Any proposals for specialist care would need to be submitted as a planning application.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the aspirations and actions for travel.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	1. The A14 is not mentioned. No action is proposed to improve the safety of the flow of the HGV lorries. There is a strong case for requiring that HGV are restricted to the inside lane where the A14 is only 2 lane. 2. No mention is made of traffic calming measures in any locations.	In terms of traffic calming, this is addressed in aspiration 3, action a - '...implement safety measures on rural roads'.	Added a sentence with regard to the importance of A14 to aspiration 4 (above paragraph 11.9. Make reference to the HGV issue.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Travelling is acceptable with the current population of Barrow	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	11.5 (2) Village connected & to towns? Aspiration 1 much talk about buses and cars Aspiration 2 Stricter observation of travel speed, off road security, inclement weather affecting surfaces no mention of cycle routes Aspiration 3 Very important. Not just about circumnavigating a village but leading to town and employment as this is not always available locally. Earlier statement what St Eds to look like in 2031 will these still be issues then? Cost etc. Cycles will increase in number as will electric powered vehicles requiring affordable charging points in villages	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves					We are aware that developers have collaborated with the Borough Council to undertake a detailed and extensive traffic survey of the road network around the town. It is most regrettable that the findings of this survey have not been made available in time to inform public response to the Vision 2031 consultations. The reality is that local bus services are unlikely to profoundly change the general preference for car use and a growth in private vehicle traffic should be assumed. If the wider use of bus services is to be an imperative, then the timings of those services, particularly late evening provision must be addressed.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15999	Gillian Austin					(Also inserted into question 23 Barrow) I am writing regarding the proposed development in Barrow, as set out in the Rural Vision 2031 documentation. I am not against development in Barrow and recognise it as quite a positive step, as long as the infrastructure is there to support it. The main reason for my writing, is with regards to, current and future cycle route provision. I have meant to get in contact with you ever since the main Bury to Saxham Road has been signposted as being part of the Sustrans route. I was extremely disappointed at this decision, of suggesting that this road was potentially considered to be at all safe for cyclists.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gillian Austin					<p>I have lived in Barrow since 1998, I am a keen cyclist and have been a member of Sustrans since the early 1990's. My husband cycles from Barrow to Newmarket daily for work, and used to do the same to Bury, however, he, rarely, and I have never used the main road from Barrow to Bury (which includes the sustrans route), as we consider it to be too dangerous. It is well known by my friends, colleagues and family as being a route that would not be considered for cycling. There are many sweeping bends, where cars etc are prone to overtaking bikes, without the ability to see what is coming in the opposite direction. It is a fast road, with cars frequently driving at over 50mph. If the A14 is closed for any reason, it is used as the detour route for the traffic from the dual carriageway. It is used by many school buses and is the bus route into town and it is used as a cut through for lorries to get to Saxham industrial estate and the farm in Great Saxham. The road is also extremely prone to flooding.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gillian Austin					<p>It is an insult to those residents west of Bury that this is considered adequate to be a continuation of the cycle route that runs on fantastic cycle paths and traffic free routes to the east of Bury. I am pleased that those cycle routes do exist for those on the east of Bury, but to the west, we literally have no safe route into town. I would love to cycle to work, which is the distance of just 6 miles, but it is just not worth me putting myself at risk.</p> <p>The use of the Bury to Saxham road as the Sustrans route shows a distinct lack of imagination, and seems to me, to have been an exercise in 'ticking box'. Surely, a route could have been considered to Risby or to the Saxham industrial estate, which are only 3 miles out of Bury town centre they could have then provided the link for Barrow, the Saxhams, Cavenham, Risby, even villages such as Flempton and Lackford. All we need is a safe route to get past the A14 interchange at Westley.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gillian Austin					<p>It would then, through Saxham industrial estate and Little Saxham, link up to the current route which would continue on largely traffic free roads out to Denham, Higham and onto Newmarket direction. The reason I have been prompted to write this letter now, is that with the proposed developments, we are now looking at a further 100+ cars that could potentially be driving along that 'supposed' cycle route into Bury every day, plus all the goods vehicles and (hopefully) buses that will be serving our enlarged village.</p> <p>I also think that Sustrans need to be aware that part of one of the routes, that they put their name to, is dangerous, with experienced cyclists not willing to risk riding it, for the reasons listed above, and that is the reason I am copying this letter to them.</p> <p>Six miles is a fantastic distance to cycle into Bury. On traffic free, or light traffic, routes, it could be a well used route into town, tackling all the well known problems of congestion and health.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Gillian Austin					<p>So in conclusion, I would like to state that the current cycle route from Bury to Little Saxham is unsafe and not fit for purpose, and should be reviewed, particularly by Sustrans, and also that with any development in Barrow, it is essential to look at safe routes into Bury to match those to the east of the town. If cost remains an issue, just ensure that a safe route is available around the Westley interchange to get cyclists to Risby or Saxham. This is what I consider to be a priority for Rural Vision 2031.</p> <p>Just as a footnote, my husband and I have raised our concerns previously to various Borough Councillors who have attended meetings in Barrow, their response has generally been that they do understand, but there is nothing really they can do and it is up to us to educate car drivers!!! What a fantastic vision!!!</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Councils request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process.			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). They need to be modified. Increasing the Borough's 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 proposed expansion of the Town and rural areas. 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 and/or others for major improvements.	Thank you for responding	None - address as part of delivery plan.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	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 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)				Many boroughs and towns have been expanded without infrastructure improvements, with disastrous effect. 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.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>All of these aspirations should include references to improved public rights of way as actions for delivery. Public rights of way can offer safe, off-road solutions to many travel issues.</p> <p>Aspiration 2 should be modified to read - Villages are connected by safe and attractive networks of public rights of way and permissive paths (i.e. rather than footpaths) as this is a neater definition.</p> <p>SCC supports and continually looks for ways to provide better and more up to date bus timetables and other passenger transport information in rural areas and employ 2 Information Officers in the Passenger Transport Unit to ensure this happens. However, they need to be informed by telephone or e-mail should anyone in a rural area come across passenger transport information that is inaccurate.</p>	Thank you for responding	Amend paragraph 11.5(2)
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>SCC has also greatly improved its dedicated Suffolk On Board website and supports the implementation of high-speed broadband services in rural areas to ensure people can use it easily. The Passenger Transport Unit also employs a dedicated western area Bus Network Planner who is contactable by phone or e-mail should information be needed. SCC supports the promotion and use of its community transport toolkit for the creation of community transport services in very remote rural areas. SCC also employs a small but experienced community transport team that can advise on the creation of these services, as can the Community Transport Association.</p>	Thank you for responding	None - to be addressed at Delivery Plan stage.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				However, residents of rural St. Edmundsbury have access to 1 Suffolk Links DRT service, 3 Dial-a-Ride services and 2 community car services. We recommend that anyone thinking of setting up a community transport service contact our community transport team well in advance of doing so to ensure that existing services are not duplicated and that the correct advice is given at the first time of asking. SCC fully supports the intention for St. Edmundsbury BC to channel any funding it has towards better co-ordination of existing passenger transport services, and recommends regular contact with both the western area Bus Network Planner and the community transport team as they are best placed to advise on how this might be achieved.	Thank you for responding	None - address as part of delivery plan.
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				SCC supports the aspiration to (mainly) ensure bus services are situated only where they are viable. This is the general direction in which SCC's PTU wishes to take bus service provision. However, SEBC needs to be mindful that, particularly at off-peak times, a small number of well-used bus services are viable, but only with the help of sponsorship from SCC as Passenger Transport Authority. SCC Network Planners are keen to hear from Borough, Town and Parish Councils about the small number of sponsored bus routes in the borough to ensure the sponsorship funds are well spent. SCC supports the extension of the reach of public transport services by deploying alternative types of passenger transport such as demand-responsive and/or community transport services. Suffolk Links Three Towns serves approximately 20 parishes to the north and east of Haverhill which can link people into direct bus services to Haverhill, Sudbury, Bury and Newmarket.	Thank you for responding	None - address as part of delivery plan.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				This is a registered public transport service that will accept concessionary fare passes and operates 07.00-19.00 Monday - Saturday. SCC sponsors 13 of these services in rural Suffolk. Due to the current financial climate, no new services are planned in the short to medium term. However, the whole point of the services is that are flexible and can respond to changes within the conventional bus market. Therefore, the areas of operation can be widened or narrowed to suit different conditions. SCC fully supports the aspiration regarding the encouragement of car sharing and recommends that anyone who is thinking of setting up such a scheme contact Suffolk ACRE, who are experienced at helping facilitate these.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council supports the provision of bypasses where they are appropriate for the developments and villages they serve. In some instances the provision of a relief road or internal distributor road by a development could be considered as an alternative, and on that basis it may be appropriate to rephrase 11.10a) to read 'where appropriate'. In addition 11.10b refers to reducing areas of poor air quality, there is only one designated air quality area within the rural area, this is in Gt Barton, the phrasing here assumes poor air quality; preferred wording would be to ensure that air quality does not deteriorate to a level of concern in the rural areas.	Thank you for responding	Amend 11.10b accordingly
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	With bus services being slashed and rail fares the highest in Europe, public transport is simply untenable in a Rural Environment. There is no funding for roads, so most of the aspirations, are just that, aspirations which pad out the 'Green' credentials of this document	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Public transport is as deficient as broadband access; without good public transport providing access at a reasonable price to towns and cultural resources this policy will not be achieved.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes	The proposals seem broadly sensible given the current budget constraints but realistically I suspect more robust action (and more money) is needed in this area to achieve significant results.	Thank you for responding	None - issue regarding the robust action to be addressed in the <u>delivery plan</u> .
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Yes. Perhaps the County could adopt a new designation of lanes where traffic speeds can be kept low to encourage use by cyclists etc?	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	<p>Risby Parish Council agrees with the aspirations but would like to make the following points: Young people cannot afford cars due to the high cost of insurance and fuel. With no reliable alternative they are forced to move into towns. Because the bus services in rural areas have reduced they are not a suitable option for people who need to get to work or who would like to go into towns at weekends or in the evenings.</p> <p>It is costly to provide pavements within villages let alone outside. A lot of villages still do not have pavements and without paying large sums of money themselves which they do not have, there is no prospect of getting them. Rural roads are often narrow and vehicles travel too fast. Policing of rural roads is virtually non-existent making them dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists alike.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				<p>Providing safe cycle routes is an excellent idea and should be a priority but will require a large amount of money and will depend on the co-operation of Suffolk County Council as well with more priority being given to rural communities.</p> <p>Rural footpaths are important for village residents and visitors. Unfortunately due to cutbacks, a lot of footpaths do not get cut regularly making them impassable in the summer.</p> <p>Demand Responsive Transport is seen as an alternative but it can increase journey times dramatically, making it a less attractive option. People will only use public transport if it is quick, not too expensive and offers a regular, reliable service. Rural communities have become so dependent on cars it will be difficult to change this. Car sharing can work but is difficult in villages where children attend lots of different schools.</p> <p>The Fit Villages project is one success. They have proved very popular and residents have enjoyed being able to attend classes in the village without needing to travel.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Young people cannot afford cars due to the high cost of insurance and fuel. With no reliable alternative they are forced to move into towns. Because the bus services in rural areas have reduced they are not a suitable option for people who need to get to work or who would like to go into towns at weekends or in the evenings.</p> <p>It is costly to provide pavements within villages let alone outside. A lot of villages still do not have pavements and without paying large sums of money themselves which they do not have, there is no prospect of getting them. Rural roads are often narrow and vehicles travel too fast. Policing of rural roads is virtually non-existent making them dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists alike.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>Examples include Stradishall which has asked for a section of pavement along the A143 next to the Highpoint Estate and opposite the village shop. This is deemed low priority by Suffolk County Council despite being alongside an A road. Unless the village can pay for a new pavement itself, it will have to wait for 20+ years as priority is given to places like Ipswich where there have already been accidents or fatalities.</p> <p>Providing safe cycle routes is an excellent idea and should be a priority but will require a large amount of money and will depend on the co-operation of Suffolk County Council as well with more priority being given to rural communities.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>Rural footpaths are important for village residents and visitors. Unfortunately due to cutbacks, a lot of footpaths do not get cut regularly making them impassable in the summer. Repairs or getting replacement signs can take months unless there is an immediate danger to walkers and Rights of Way budgets have been cut.</p> <p>Demand Responsive Transport is seen as an alternative but it can increase journey times dramatically, making it a less attractive option. People will only use public transport if it is quick, not too expensive and offers a regular, reliable service. A direct bus from Ousden to Bury St Edmunds can take 35 minutes approximately, but using DRT the journey increases to over an hour and sometimes as much as 1hr 20mins.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required
	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils				<p>Rural communities have become so dependent on cars it will be difficult to change this. Car sharing can work but is difficult in villages where children attend lots of different schools.</p> <p>The Fit Villages project is one success. Ousden, Stansfield and Lidgate have benefited from Pilates and salsa classes. They have proved very popular and residents have enjoyed being able to attend classes in the village. Sadly the class in Lidgate had to stop because the instructor moved away and it has been impossible to find a replacement teacher who is willing to travel to Lidgate and work in the evenings. Stansfields funding is about to be cut.</p>	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	Yes, and we must lobby for better broadband in the rural areas.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes	It is very difficult to encourage people to cycle or walk when speeding is such a problem on rural roads. I like the idea of greenways but landowner consent can be difficult.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	The proposed barrow hill development in not on any bus route. Access to the A14 would mean travel through the village . Access to bury through the back roads means increased traffic on unsuitable roads. Children have to make 5 road crossings on dangerous cross roads to bus stops on inadequate pavements which constantly flood causing people and children to have to walk in the road. Barrow hill east is not suitable due to no pavements ,safety increased traffic and accessibility to development on dangerous corners.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	By passes are only become approved when the situation IS critical. More needs to be done with experimental at road congestion hot spots even if it does not work. As it will be traffic as usual for years to come. With continual talking and no action.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21677E	Mark Filler				no		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 12: Travel aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 12a - Do you agree with our travel aspirations?	Question 12b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes	Public transport needs to be linked together both in terms of time tables and pricing. Link the A1307 and the A 143 better. Make the cost low and more people will be using it. Prices need to be available on the internet - increasing numbers of people use the internet to find information and if the prices are not there, maybe they will just use a car	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	Generally agree however the policy with regard to the larger routes esp. bypasses is not sustainable transport policy and other measures such as public transport will be required to reduce congestion. No real congestion exists in the district outside of the main centres.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	All good ideas, but again, volume, safety and noise from traffic is a major concern. Presumably, all these issues will be addressed.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	Yes - support proposals to promote active & safe travel options, with consideration for the very old and very young.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes	Infrastructure needs to be suitable on the main arterial roads within the Borough	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				Environment Our 'Vision' would be for the Parish to become more environmentally friendly, by i) Increasing the number of recycling bins throughout the Parish producing an income which would benefit the Parish. ii) Encouraging the take-up of grants available to make all existing properties more carbon-neutral. iii) Examining the feasibility of creating carbon neutral energy sources, e.g. photo-voltaic farms within the Parish.	The Parishes Vision is noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				Aspiration one of Section 12 fails to mention modal shift from single occupancy car use as a way of addressing carbon emissions. As part of the TAAP, there are proposals to improve the bus services between Thetford and Bury St Edmunds. This work is being progressed as part of the Urban Extension Planning Application. Under the duty to co-operate, this could be an area where joint working between neighbouring Councils and operators could result in improved public transport service that benefits St Edmundsbury and Breckland residents. Perhaps another action therefore is 'improve the provision of public transport to enable travel around the Borough and beyond by modes other than single occupancy car use, working with neighbouring Councils'. Breckland Council would raise a soundness objection due to the lack of reference to the potential for cross boundary working.	Agree that reference should be made to multi modal shift and cross boundary transport	This is covered in the travel section aspiration 2.
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Para 12.7 appears to be very negative towards wind turbines as does 12.8d, surely this bias is not helpful in a consultation.	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	Changes in PD rights is a National Planning Policy issue	The comment is noted	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Strongly agree with the councils commitment to being 'sensitive to people's concerns about turbines' and its acknowledgement that 'wind turbines can be noisy and over-dominant in the landscape'. Strongly agree with support for homes to improve energy efficiency and use of low carbon generation schemes but commercial/industrial wind turbines would have a highly detrimental effect on the tourist economy in conservation areas and undermine the well-being of anyone living less than 2km from the turbines. We re-state our view that no industrial-scale windfarm development should take place within 2 kilometres of a residential dwelling	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	Yes - but no document worth its salt these days has a hope of being adopted if sustainability and climate change does not appear somewhere.	The comment is noted	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Additionally, The emphasis for the efficient storage of winter water extraction requires consideration for both domestic and agricultural users.	The Joint Development Management Document sets out policies on rain water harvesting and sustainable drainage	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd	yes	Generally we support the thrust of the aspirations and proposed actions but this does not cover appropriate development on the edge of settlements where they are sustainable or on previously developed brownfield sites.	Sites on the edges of villages have been assessed for development potential in the opportunity and constraints document and allocated where appropriate.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	No large wind turbines on - shore encourage PV instead	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the sustainability aspirations and actions.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes	Yes, in general terms. We would also like to point out that the Sustainability Appraisal for the Rural Vision 2031 DPD demonstrates that the Shepherd's Grove, Stanton employment area scores highly in terms of sustainability with only one 'red' item, as a small part of the site is just within 2km of a SSSI (Shepherd's Grove woodland).	The comment is noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Everything you propose is important but there also needs to be a drive to persuade everyone to use less energy, thus reducing the need for generation. The use of outdoor gas heaters e.g. in pubs should be prohibited. Shops should not have automatically opening doors. Temperatures in public buildings should be kept as low as possible.	The comments are noted, however these issues are outside of the councils influence	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	If we are honest, nobody really knows the effects of climate change.	The comments are noted.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Poor selection of photographs show us the real proposal Existing buildings part of any new power scheme too again affordable	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Yes, but many of the actions proposed are compromised or fall short in view of two major issues: Over-Development. The biggest contribution to climate change is the proposed over-expansion of the Town and villages. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extremely harmful effects of building thousands of houses and substantially increasing the population in the Borough by some 34%. Water Supply, Drought and Energy Costs . Vision assumes that water supplies will be sufficient not only for the current population of the Town and villages, but for an massively expanded population. Anglian Water's statement to the Council [Page 56, item 10.5 of Vision] that there is sufficient capacity in its supply to accommodate growth to 2031 has a number of caveats concerning demand and supply development schemes.	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 Council works with utility providers to ensure there is sufficient provision to support the allocations in the Vision documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - 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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the 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.		

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Sustainable construction standards are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Noted - the issue of targets to be addressed as part of the Delivery Plan	No changes required - dealt with in Delivery Plan

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				We consider that the policies contained in the St Edmundsbury Local Development Framework, together with national requirements on flooding and development, will be sufficient to ensure that flood risk and drainage is managed appropriately in Bury St Edmunds. The Flood and Water Management Act gives Suffolk County Council lead responsibility for flooding in the county and the power to impose requirements on development to manage flood risk, not only from river flooding but surface and groundwater water flooding in the localised areas. As the lead Flood Authority we will continue to work with the borough council and 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 commitment to working with the Council is welcomed and noted.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no	There are no feasible arguments for the cost, waste and subsidies for wind farms in this area. They are not economically justifiable.	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	Mostly agree, although concur about wind turbines and exactly how efficient they are, and their whole life costs. The building, construction of, and the infrastructure needed to bring electricity to use costs are conveniently lost when trumpeting their 'green' credentials.	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Refer to public transport and employment responses above. In addition, consider water reserves currently below the levels of 30 years ago with a population double what it was then. What will sustain the water supply for a community having its housing stock increased by more than 10%, which means a short term (10-15 years) population increase of 20%?	Water use has remained the same over the last 20 years despite the increase in population down to better education and use of water meters. Specific water issues dealt with in village sections.	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes	Broadly agree but suspect a greater emphasis on transport may be realistic and may also help provide greater impetus to improving public transport. Also, will mention again here whether feasibility of community combined heat and power schemes ought to be studied.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Yes, but: Cost of exceeding govt targets for new build may be too high. Encouragement to improve exg buildings will have bigger impact. Bio-fuels eg ethanol counter-productive.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	DO we have enough wind to generate electricity in Suffolk from wind turbines. I would like more research before the area is littered with them.	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	there are two main routes through barrow both busy and narrow with massive flooding problems all the way from the A14 to barrow and barrow to bury st Edmunds. Verges are washed away causing dangerous driving conditions in the village and surrounding area.	Agricultural run off and lack of ditch clearance can cause flooding issues. These issues need to be dealt with the landowners.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	carbon reduction on new development should not be so stringent that otherwise well considered proposals are rendered unviable.	Sustainable construction standards are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 13: Sustainability and Climate Change aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 13a - Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?	Question 13b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	Other renewable energy sources eg Solar and biogas should be mentioned	Noted - reference is made in aspiration to '...types of renewable energy/low carbon regeneration..'. In addition, action 'b' refers to bio-fuels.	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes	There needs to be very tight control over Wind Farms and ensure that local communities are informed and listened to without feeling of dismissal	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	If the proposed new homes all had good insulation and solar panels, hopefully this would reduce the need for wind turbines.	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>Crime</p> <p>Within the Parish Plan results, there was a degree of concern expressed about crime even though the statistics within the Parish itself show only a small amount of crime. We can never alleviate the fear of crime completely, but we can aspire to reducing that fear.</p> <p>Our 'Vision', therefore, is to reduce the concern about crime and actual crime within the Parish by re-establishing the 'Neighbourhood Watch Scheme' throughout the Parish, to publish the crime reports, increasing the lit areas and by increasing the visibility of the Police.</p>	The parishes Vision is noted	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	While the aspiration to reduce crime and the opportunity for crime is welcomed the Council must acknowledge in its proposed actions that vacant building create an opportunity for misuse. The actions should include the encouragement of the re-use of redundant buildings to help prevent their misuse and deterioration as a result of criminal activity.	Noted - the Council is committed to ensuring that empty properties are bought back into use. This is to ensure that homes and other properties are put to best use. The Council recognises that redundant and dilapidated buildings attract crime.	Aspiration 3c in Homes and Communities amended to include empty homes and buildings
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	Crime is low, but increasing. With less police officers it is inevitable that the police will be less visible in rural areas. If St Eds intend to change this then it has to commit more funds to the police force - which it does not want to do, so achieving these aspirations could be very difficult to achieve - but we welcome them as aspirations. We are concerned with aspiration 1 (e) - Encouraging local people to take responsibility for keeping villages safe, as recent legal cases have shown that this is not a wise course of action - so this could be an issue.	Whilst St Edmundsbury cannot directly affect the numbers of police officers working and visible in our communities, we do work in partnership with the Police, both strategically and operationally to ensure that hotspots of crime are identified and a problem solving approach is taken to resolve issues. This approach will involve a statutory response which is supported by community actions	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisatio n company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Provision for youth is a key priority for Clare and we would welcome support from SEBC in our drive to secure a permanent youth facility in one of the Clare Country Park buildings.	The Council will continue to work closely with Clare Parish Council to discuss the issues raised.	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Brave words unlikely to achieve anything	The implementation of the aspirations will require joint working with many different organisations	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the aspirations and actions for Crime and safety.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	A more visible police presence is needed, especially in the hours of darkness, when worst crime occurs. (Several sheds have recently been broken into and garden machines stolen).	Whilst St Edmundsbury cannot directly affect the numbers of police officers working and visible in our communities, we do work in partnership with the Police, both strategically and operationally to ensure that hotspots of crime are identified and a problem solving approach is taken to resolve issues. This approach will involve a statutory response which is supported by community actions	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				no	Wind turbines cannot fulfil our energy requirements. They don't work.	This comment does not relate to this aspiration	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	We need more law reinforcement on the streets, not less as being planned by the current Government.	Whilst St Edmundsbury cannot directly affect the numbers of police officers working and visible in our communities, we do work in partnership with the Police, both strategically and operationally to ensure that hotspots of crime are identified and a problem solving approach is taken to resolve issues. This approach will involve a statutory response which is supported by community actions	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	13.1 Guidance/training Targets made of those residents trying to achieve this aim 15.5 'Lead the response' How? Elderly and young link here as they need to assist driving change in attitudes and behaviour Trading standards/drop in centres/advice on cold calling protocol etc	The implementation of the aspirations will require joint working with many different organisations	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisatio n company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves					One of the challenges to emerge out of Haverhill's fast growth without concurrent support infrastructure and employment availability was the town's well charted social issues. Bury St. Edmunds and its environs are extremely fortunate to be comparatively both safe and low crime - and strenuous efforts are required if this is to be maintained.	The comments in relation to Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill are noted	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b). Whilst the aspirations are fine, increasing the population of the rural areas and the Borough as a whole is likely to lead to an increase in crime and ant-social behaviour. The Core Strategy must be revisited and the planned housing numbers be reduced across the Borough.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<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 St Edmundsbury, 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.</p> <p>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. Most relevant is the provision of sprinklers in new development.</p>	Agree that issue of fire safety needs to be addressed.	Aspiration 2d added around fire safety. Flooding issues are covered in the aspirations in the Infrastructure and Services section.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				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
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	In practice, the police force needs to be greatly increased; the opposite is happening at present.	Whilst St Edmundsbury cannot directly affect the numbers of police officers working and visible in our communities, we do work in partnership with the Police, both strategically and operationally to ensure that hotspots of crime are identified and a problem solving approach is taken to resolve issues. This approach will involve a statutory response which is supported by community actions	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			no	Approach not considered broad enough. Proposed actions limited to treating symptoms rather than remedying the root causes of a deteriorating society such as lack of parenting/inadequacy of school discipline and government failure to enforce standards of social respect. However it is accepted that Government action is required to address such issues rather than local government.	The ability of the Council to address these issues is limited. The implementation of the aspirations will require joint working with many different organisations	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes	Yes.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Wools				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	<p>Risby Parish Council disagrees that the level of rural crime is low. There has been a large increase in the number of burglaries particularly of outbuildings and there is very real concern amongst rural communities. The Police are overstretched and it is difficult to get volunteers for schemes like Neighbourhood Watch.</p> <p>Speeding is a very real concern in villages, but the Police struggle to carry out speed checks due to other commitments. It is difficult to get enough volunteers to run Community Speed Watch schemes.</p> <p>Young people are poorly catered for in villages and more opportunities need to be provided for them so that they have got safe places to meet up.</p>	Noted - this issue of property security, speeding and community facilities are identified within the aspirations	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Levels of rural crime are not as low as they used to be. There has been a large increase in the number of burglaries particularly of outbuildings and there is very real concern amongst rural communities. The Police are overstretched and it is difficult to get volunteers for schemes like Neighbourhood Watch.</p> <p>Speeding is a very real concern in villages, but the Police struggle to carry out speed checks due to other commitments. It is difficult to get enough volunteers to run Community Speed Watch schemes. Some villages have tried to combine, but have still not been able to get enough volunteers.</p>	Noted - this issue of property security, speeding and community facilities are identified within the aspirations	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	There is too little uniformed presence in the rural areas, and I would like to see this improved to deter crime and anti social behaviour.	Whilst St Edmundsbury cannot directly affect the numbers of police officers working and visible in our communities, we do work in partnership with the Police, both strategically and operationally to ensure that hotspots of crime are identified and a problem solving approach is taken to resolve issues. This approach will involve a statutory response which is supported by community actions	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisatio n company	Question 14a - Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?	Question 14b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes	Safety issues must include real enforcement of speed and traffic regulations	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes	Yes, with specific regard to land at Barrow Hill, Barrow provision is made for the delivery of a dental surgery within the site to meet an identified need within the village. The Council should seek to support developments that deliver infrastructure and services in villages. The Council should also seek to give preference to developments, which are located in flood zone 1 and which can provide adequate connections to foul and surface water drainage. With regard to land at Barrow Hill, the Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal undertaken by Ardent Consulting Engineers demonstrates that the development is well located and fully deliverable in this regard.	Noted. This site is allocated for housing and a dental surgery.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	Yes - But consult and listen to local opinions before implementing decisions	Noted - consultation forms and important part of any infrastructure development.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council				14.12 Contrary to your statement Broadband coverage is being extended to the rural areas - it will sadly just take a bit longer to deliver.	Comments noted. Agree that statement needs amending	Amend statement to state that broadband is slowly extending to the rural areas
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	Whilst fast broadband is desirable, it is not known what measures can be taken by the Council to influence its distribution into rural areas	Noted - the Council has a lobbying role in order to secure broadband in rural areas	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Suggest strengthening Aspiration 5 by providing support/advice to owners of current properties that are at an increased risk of flooding. Note that use of large amounts of concrete necessary to the building of wind turbines can impact adversely on water tables and flood areas.	Planning policies in relation to wind turbines are set out in the Joint Development Management Document. Insert new text on providing support/advice to owners of current properties that are at an increased risk of flooding.	Added a new action paragraph 14.15c
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no	The moved towards recovering the value of waste should not centre around incineration as seen with the recent high profile actions of the waste centre proposed at Stanton. Education on the segregation of wastes and then the use of modern technology to degrade black bin waste for rural occupants must be a priority.	Agree	Amend paragraph 14.7 and add a new action 1c
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	We agree with the aspirations and associated actions but consider an additional action should be added to Aspiration 1: 'St Edmundsbury Borough Council shall work with other authorities and infrastructure providers to take account of the need for strategic infrastructure provision and identify shortfalls and nationally significant infrastructure opportunities across their areas'.	Agree that need to reference how infrastructure will be provided.	Make reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the aspirations and actions for infrastructure.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	No - there should also be an aspiration to ensure that other policies of the Vision seek to achieve the implementation of major infrastructure proposals identified on the proposals maps (such as new access roads), where such schemes are supported by local communities and there are potential development solutions being put forward that could result in the provision of such infrastructure.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the details of delivery and implementation	Make reference to close working with infrastructure agencies and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Para 14.8 is incorrect. Rougham has gas. Proposals for development should include an assessment (rather than a hope) that services can cope with new demands.	Noted	Amend paragraph 14.8 to include Rougham
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Support those using oil for domestic heating purposes, have I overlooked this elsewhere Support for sifting waste at source however occupier has little say in packaging content and size Advice on packaging itself or disposal needs to be more prominent Unfair to penalise ? with over the top packaging Rates incentives to commercial concern locally to support with recycling	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15930	Claire Brindley	Environment Agency				Para 14.6. In relation to the constraints and opportunities for rural development, your Water Cycle Study should be referred to in order to ascertain the environmental capacity of individual settlements. This is particularly in relation to water quality issues arising as a result of the discharge of increased volumes of treated water effluent. (See EA response in relation to BSE and Haverhill)	Comments are noted.	Set out the Water capacity issues in the relevant village sections.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves					<p>In both the Vision documents, the majority of new employment opportunities are established to the south side of Bury's 'railway east-west divide'. The major commuter crossing points are already constrained by single alternative working and are completely inadequate and unsustainable taken against a proposed increase in the size of the town by over 30% in just 20 years.</p> <p>Areas that are already routinely gridlocked will become wholly impassable, particularly at peak times. In addition, greater attention should focus on micro businesses in the rural areas, including those which operate from home, with a key priority being the improvement of digital infrastructure and high speed internet.'</p>	Noted the encouragement of digital infrastructure in rural areas and this is addressed in the Jobs and Economy Section of the document.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications given below in b).Yes, but many of the actions proposed are compromised or fall short in view of two major issues: Over-Development. The biggest contribution to climate change is the proposed expansion of the Borough. Any action taken to mitigate climate change in the aspirations will never counter the extreme harmful of effects of expanding the housing and population to the extent proposed. Water Supply, Drought and Energy Costs . Vision assumes that water supplies will be sufficient not only for the current population of the Borough but many more inhabitants. Anglian water's reported statement that there is sufficient capacity in its supply to accommodate growth to 2031 has a number of caveats about concerning demand and supply development schemes.	The 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 Council works with utility providers to ensure there is sufficient provision to support the allocations in the Vision documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the 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 a further 5,900 houses? Little or no development should go ahead until the water supply can be guaranteed and other infrastructure and service requirements necessary to support such development are in place, or at least guaranteed to be provided when demanded	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				We strongly 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 14.3 and look forward to supporting you in this process, if required. We would 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. 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.	See above	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	They need to precede all housing development.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes	Broadly yes, although I would emphasise more heavily and clearly the importance of high-speed broadband for business/economic development reasons.	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Flooding: Prevent farmers from installing more field drains where there is a known risks of flash flooding!	This is beyond the council's control and does not require planning consent	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	It is disappointing that there are no plans for the gas network to be extended to villages, particularly with the high cost of heating oil, which is forcing some rural families into fuel poverty.	Gas network have advised there are no proposals to extend the network in the rural areas in the foreseeable future.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Community Infrastructure Levies will favour larger communities which will be having more development. As no development is allowed in smaller villages, they will not receive any income from the levies. It would be fairer to distribute the income across the Borough, particularly to communities in which development is not permitted.</p> <p>It is disappointing that there are no plans for the gas network to be extended to villages, particularly with the high cost of heating oil, which is forcing some rural families into fuel poverty. Some properties in villages like Ousden still do not have mains drainage either. Money should be put in to improving these infrastructures in local communities.</p> <p>Some properties in rural villages (Stansfield) are difficult to insure now that the Environment Agency has drawn up a flood risk map. No provision is made in this document for these properties to protect them from flooding.</p>	Gas network have advised there are no proposals to extend the network in the rural areas in the foreseeable future.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes	Shame about the lack of planned expansion to the gas network.	Gas network have advised there are no proposals to extend the network in the rural areas in the foreseeable future.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	The infrastructure in Barrow can't cope now. We are not on mains gas so increased lorry movements delivering fuel. The sewage system blocks constantly causing sewage to back into peoples gardens. the drains are not capable of removing surface water so even small amounts of rain cause flooding.	Gas network have advised there are no proposals to extend the network in the rural areas in the foreseeable future. The allocations in the village are based on an assessment of infrastructure and environmental capacity.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	This needs to be revisited and justified as the onward concern for water IS NOT REFLECTED in this report.Who's data is right?	Infrastructure includes many other factors besides water, all of which have been included at an appropriate level of detail for this document	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no	Rural areas have already lost the Explore card to help with the cost of public transport, libraries are under threat so I think introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy to be paid by rural residents already under financial pressure will be well received.	The Community Infrastructure Levy is to be paid by developers with the monies being distributed to appropriate local community projects	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 15: Infrastructure and Services aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 15a - Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?	Question 15b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes	Aspiration 4 could include the building of on farm reservoirs	This is too specific to include in this document. These issues are dealt with on a case by case basis	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion	Recommend that there is consultation with health on whether/not a health impact assessment is required for some infrastructure developments.	Consultation on the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan will take place at the same time as the V2031 consultation	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	While the aspiration to provide cultural and leisure opportunities is welcomed the Council must acknowledge in its proposed actions that vacant building create an opportunity for misuse. The actions should include the encouragement of the re-use of redundant buildings to help prevent their misuse and deterioration.	Noted - the Council is committed to ensuring that empty properties are bought back into use. This is to ensure that homes and other properties are put to best use. The Council recognises that redundant and dilapidated buildings attract crime.	Aspiration 3c in Homes and Communities amended to include empty homes and buildings
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	Controlling anti-social behaviour without the police staffing to back it up will be difficult to achieve. Making grant applications more available, understandable and easier to apply for would be welcomed.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes	Aspiration 1 - to improve the leisure facilities - is fully supported. 7 Given the economic climate, the provision of these facilities should be sought wherever possible, as a planning gain related to proposed development.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Clare PC strongly agree with these aspirations and believe that many of them can be delivered through the Business Plan that it has been put together for Clare Country Park. The support of SEBC in progressing this plan would be much appreciated.	The support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	Yes - but annoyance is caused by rural areas being exclusively encouraged to promote tourism/leisure as the means of maintaining financial viability. The countryside is not just an empty space for urban dwellers to come and admire, it is also a place of work.	Noted - the Council recognises that the importance of securing the economic viability of rural areas. The aspirations relating to jobs and economy address this issue.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Tourism should be encouraged, B&B, holiday lets etc.	Noted - the Council agrees that tourism, along with other businesses, support the economic viability of rural areas.	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the aspirations and actions for culture.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15865	Mr Graham Mackie				no	<p>I have briefly scanned through the Bury St Edmunds and the Rural documents and see no mention of the provision for Scout Groups.</p> <p>At present the District Team supports Scouting in the following places:</p> <p>Bury St Edmunds: 1st Bury - Tollgate Lane; 6th Bury - College Lane; 10th Bury - Hardwick Middle School Grounds Portakabin</p> <p>Rural:</p> <p>Scout Hut - Great Barton Playing Field Scout Portakabin - Horringer Nr the Community Centre 1st Honing - St Edmunds Church RAF Honing Ixworth - Ixworth Community Centre and Middle School Lake - Back Street Millennial - Scout Building St Andrews Street Millennial 1st Red Lodge - Red Lodge Millennium Centre Lavender Close Thurston - Cavendish Hall Church Road Thurston Bradfield Park Campsite- Suffolk facility</p>	Agree that references to organisations delivering leisure and culture activities need to be broadened in the document, however it would not be appropriate to mention individual organisations.	Aspiration 4 amended

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr Graham Mackie					<p>The provision of Scouting throughout Suffolk generally is provided by volunteers many in uniform with long term commitments to scouting and the support structure's developed from families of the youth we support, the ages from 6 to 18. From 18 onwards adults are included until they pass-on, one of our active scouters is 84 years old and still supports us at Great Barton.</p> <p>An opportunity to contribute to the Vision 2031 is therefore very important, as we have a vision of our own for growth nationally.</p> <p>www.scouts.org.uk/vision2018</p> <p>Our contacts are:</p> <p>District Commissioner - Mr Keith Barber - keith.barber.583@btinternet.com Deputy District Commissioner - Mr Paul Stafford - paul.stafford57@btinternet.com District Chairman - Mr Paul Ruthven - ruthven13@btinternet.com</p>	The important work of volunteers (which includes Scouting) is recognised throughout the document. In particular reference to culture and leisure, it is recognised that volunteers and community groups have a significant role to play in delivery aspirations 1 and 2.	No changes required
	Mr Graham Mackie					<p>County Commissioner - Mrs Jenny Mullan - cc@suffolkscouts.org.uk</p> <p>I have attached a couple of promotional leaflets for your info, they have the contacts for Great Barton only, but are generic for anywhere.</p> <p>We look forward to be included in the Vision 2031. (See attached leaflets)</p>		
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	Strongly support maximisation of tourist potential. I note that the current provider of tours for Americans of USAF airfields is based in Salisbury. Surely we can do better?	Comments noted. This issue is beyond the Councils control	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	People make their own leisure and its very hypocritical to suggest building these housing estates will improve our culture in any way.	Noted - The Council recognises that its role is to support communities to ensure that there are leisure and cultural opportunities. However, it is an individual's choice as to whether or not they wish to use this opportunities.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	15.3 (4) 'Lowest possible cost' to the council or those end users? i.e parking charges 15.4 For communities or wider area resulting in increased traffic movement. Location needs to be carefully selected.	Agree - The Council agrees that 'lowest possible cost' is not a useful phrase. This aspiration should be amended to focus on ' value for money'.	Amend - Aspiration 4

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves					These factors also influence the support and success of the areas entertainment, leisure and cultural life. It is our view that Bury St. Edmunds is quite well served by a range of venues (even if the Theatre royal is unbearably uncomfortable). Other facilities, including sport and fitness, are also high standard. For the future however, inadequate provision of parking and evening transport, certainly with increased population, could have a negative impact.	The travel section is promoting travel by alternative means of transport wherever possible which will help to reduce the need for in town car parking	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>We note that there is minimal 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 work in partnership and cooperation across the leisure, educational and wellbeing sectors. They are likely to increase their role as hubs for community activity and as access points for leisure and cultural activity. The county council vision for libraries is that they will be managed and run by paid staff, as now, with community governance groups ensuring a focus on local needs and aspirations. This should be reflected in the supporting text of this document.</p>	<p>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 should be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Amend action 1b</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	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				The Access Model for Suffolk's libraries, based on the Local Development Framework adopted by district and borough councils, identifies a continuing need for library services to be provided in rural areas. In key service centres local governance groups may choose to retain an existing library, possibly relocating to shared premises to make this affordable, or after consultation, utilise outreach activity from larger libraries, mobile library stops or drop off collections in community spaces. Lastly, please note that some of the information in paragraph 15.1 will need updating for the final version of the document. Knettishall Heath has now been transferred to the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and negotiations are ongoing for the transfer of Clare Country Park to community ownership. Suffolk County Council libraries are also currently being transferred to an Industrial and Provident Society, which will run Suffolk's libraries independently of the county council.	Noted - amendments to be made to the document in relation to the change of ownership	Amend section 15.1
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Greatly enhanced transport services, as noted above, will be crucial in achieving these aspirations. While I could travel by bus to Cambridge or Bury for a concert or play I would have to leave home before 5 pm and could not return (if at all) before nearly midnight.	Noted - the issue of public transport is addressed in the Travel section.	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	It is a good idea to consult with rural areas on what they want to achieve and work with them to achieve these aims. There should be much more partnership between the Borough Council and villages at a local level and they should be working together to support communities in the best way they can.	Noted -the Council's approach is to work in partnership and facilitate the best solution for each community. This is reflected throughout the culture and leisure section of the document, but in particular aspiration 3b	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	It is a good idea to consult with rural areas on what they want to achieve and work with them to achieve these aims. There should be much more partnership between the Borough Council and villages at a local level and they should be working together to support communities in the best way they can.	Noted -the Council's approach is to work in partnership and facilitate the best solution for each community. This is reflected throughout the culture and leisure section of the document, but in particular aspiration 3b	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	Yes but we must have sufficient provision for the supply of electricity. Fast broadband is a necessity in this day and age.	Noted -the Council supports the provision of fast Broadband in rural areas	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 16: Culture and Leisure aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 16a - Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?	Question 16b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	Yes, agree with all of that, but wonder if the local church communities could be involved with council services as well. Is there any provision for Christian/church centres in the new developments?	Developments in the rural areas are too small to facilitate new church centres. However, the provision of new facilities is considered in the strategic sites on the edge of the towns	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				Health According to the Rural Vision 2031 document, the average age at death for a man is 78.65 against a county average of 77.92. For a woman, however, it is 91.98 years against a county average of 81.96 (figures relate to 2003-7). The premature deaths, i.e. those aged under 75 years, were also below the county average. It is healthy to live in the countryside and particularly Rougham. This does give rise to other considerations, as the Parish has no medical facilities and therefore residents need to travel outside the Parish for medical treatment. People without transport attending the Moreton Hall surgery have to catch a bus into Bury St Edmunds and a further bus to Moreton Hall and repeat the process in reverse to return home, so that attending a ten minute appointment takes a whole day.	Comments are noted	No changes required
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				Our 'Vision' is the building of medical facilities, probably at the Sports Hall as it is central, to be paid for by the developers of the residential area being planned at the Moreton Hall end of the Parish and/or the developers of the industrial area which will join the two industrial areas along the A14. This surgery would be operated on a part time basis by the existing and/or the new proposed surgery on Moreton Hall, or the proposed surgery on the Rushbrooke Lane development.	The vision of the community for health facilities is noted	Make reference in the Rougham section the aspiration for health facilities in the village.
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes	Yes, with regard to land at Barrow Hill, Barrow the provision of a dental surgery will help meet the needs of the village in terms of health and wellbeing. The dental surgery is likely to be provided to the north of the development in a sustainable location where villages can walk for their dental care.	A dental surgery is included in the allocation of this site	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	All good aspirations - but affordable and achievable?	Noted - the issue of affordability and support of key partners will be addressed as part of the Delivery Plan	None - to be addressed in Delivery Plan
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion	Development within villages is an important way in which to safeguard educational establishments which should be taken into account when allocating land.	Noted - the Council agrees that the provision of educational establishment is a key consideration when planning for growth.	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	It will be important to ensure that Clare has increased health practitioner facilities to cope with a potential 25% increase in households.	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15842	Nigel Gough	CPBigwood		Euronite Ltd and Heritage Manor Ltd / Frontsouth Developments Ltd		<p>We would refer you to the answers given above which should be read in conjunction with this Policy Statement.</p> <p>We note in paragraph 16.7 that the Borough have only addressed the question of healthcare provision for residents in their homes. Because of the shortage of resources provision in the homes can only be of a limited extent. The private sector is providing increased specialist accommodation and related housing to address the elderly sector which is due to grow considerably in and beyond the Plan period and where the Borough Council must seek to allocate and plan with the private sector for increased provision in order to safeguard the welfare and amenities of that growing ageing population.</p>	Consider this is covered elsewhere in the document and that private residential care homes can be dealt with through the planning application process.	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society supports the aspirations and actions for health.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	These plans will drastically reduce our health and wellbeing, not to mention devaluing our property.	Noted	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - 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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Aspiration 2 might be expanded to emphasise the role of public rights of way for countryside access for walking and cycling, with the health and wellbeing benefits it brings. We are very pleased to see the reference to supporting an ageing population in Aspiration 3. It could be improved with an action linked to housing, which would link well to the Homes and Communities aspirations. Housing is an important determinate of health, especially in terms of supporting older people. There also ought to be an action around the accessibility of the built environment. If older people are unable (or feel unable) to access retail, health and community facilities then this has significant negative implications for health and wellbeing. It would be worth considering the recent government report; 'Lifetime Neighbourhoods'; for an holistic approach to older people, planning and housing development. 16.6c) should refer to air quality improvements 'where necessary'.	Public rights of Way and accessibility is actioned in the section on the historic and natural environment but need to cross refer in this section. Action 16.6c has been deleted as this is covered by action a.	Make reference to the historic and natural environment section
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	I hope these will include safeguarding health service provision, currently under threat from financial constraints. Additional traffic will certainly not help.	Agree - this is covered in action 1g	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	Risby PC would like to make the following points: There is too much reliance on volunteers in the actions. It is not clear how a lot of these aspirations will be achieved. The actions are not concrete enough. There was a recent pilot project called Healthsmart which aimed to bring health checks to local communities. In reality it proved difficult to set up the project as villages had to guarantee a minimum number of people to sign up which was not possible. Villages were expected to meet the cost of advertising and the eligibility criteria were too complicated. There was also a very short deadline (Jan March) which is difficult for villages which are reliant on newsletters to inform residents. What does encourage self help mean?	The Council believes the volunteering is just one way of helping to improve health and wellbeing. Other options are included in the document such as the use of technology, mobile facilities and tackling environmental issues. The comment relating to eligibility criteria and short timescales is noted and does need to be addressed by funding bodies.	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	There is too much reliance on volunteers in the actions. It can also be difficult to get enough people to participate in health and well being schemes.	The Council believes the volunteering is just one way of helping to improve health and wellbeing. Other options are included in the document such as the use of technology, mobile facilities and tackling environmental issues. The comment relating to eligibility criteria and short timescales is noted and does need to be addressed by funding bodies.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 17: Health and Wellbeing aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 17a - Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?	Question 17b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	I do, and we must ensure that health facilities in the rural areas is protected.	Agree - this is covered in action 1g	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	when you talk about health and wellbeing it is never about the people it will truly effect turning their lives upside down and the impact on their quality of life. The development behind our property aloe will swamp us on two sides removing all our views which we treasure looking over three fields to bury and removing all our privacy within a metre of our home. What about the impact on our health and wellbeing don't we count?	Issues such as privacy and overlooking will be dealt with at the planning application stage during which neighbours to development sites are consulted. The right to a view isn't a material planning consideration.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			yes	Yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	How will this policy safeguard Blackbourne Middle School?	The policy seeks to safeguard existing school sites for educational/community use	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	Policy wording is negative. Presumption in favour of sustainable development would suggest wording be positive, for example, 'Development will be considered favourably where..'	Agree that the policy could be worded more positively	Amend policy wording to read 'Development will be considered favourably where...'
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	Para 17.5 The plural of behaviour is behaviour, not behaviours. Volunteering to help in schools should be given greater priority. The heads of schools should be linked more closely to Parish Councils - and encouraged to live where they work.	The error is noted	Grammatical error in para 17.5 corrected.
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Education establishments have argued for years on the benefits of small numbers in classrooms, bigger is not better.	Classroom sizes are the responsibility of the Education Authority, Suffolk County Council	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15926	Terry Austin					Strong words - is this due to CC responsibility and not Borough Council? - 17.3 (2) Use of vacant school sites? Really is this possible? - 17.5 Focus on anti social behaviour - link between community and school working together where problem exist - Local school for local children	The policy seeks to safeguard school sites for educational/community use	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comments to make on this question in this response, but a response to this question may come forward from our Corporate Property department.	Noted	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	I would like to see better provision for the dropping off and collecting of children from school, it might be an aspiration for more people to walk to school but often it is a parent dropping off on their way to school. In Great Barton the provision for this is so limited and the whole road is unpassable and residents cannot get out of their drives, it is an accident waiting to happen.	Noted. See Great Barton village section which seeks to improve provision for dropping off/picking up at Great Barton Primary School	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	Our village school is our community we are rapidly filling up due to our outstanding report. We are a community that knows everyone and this is a family school the school does not want to increase to two classes for each year we are able to provide the education that we provide because of the size of the school the sense of community will be lost and the nature if the school increases in size. The school is currently proposing an umbrella system with middle and upper if barrow increases the pressure on the system will be to much people will not be able to go the the village school because the places will not be avaiable that is the appeal no place for the next three tiers then why would you want to live in a village when your child can't get a place at the primary,middle or upper school because of no places again this excludes people from the community. This village works at the size it is 40 properties yes managable more no.	Suffolk County Council have indicated there is capacity at the village schools for the level of development being proposed in the rural areas	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 18: Safeguarding Educational Establishments (RV4a)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 18a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?	Question 18b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15667	Matthew Hancock MP					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) treads around this issue, when we should strongly support new provision.	As a borough Council our focus is on the most appropriate education provision.	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no	I am not convinced building new schools is a financially efficient way of combating the issue of students going to school in cars. It certainly may not be effective - at my daughter's school, parents that are in walking distance still drive children to school as they are invariably then going onto their own workplace afterwards and time is not sufficient to then walk home and get the car - it makes sense to just drive to school then onto work. People's busy lives in today's society means that they are usually in the car and tag the school run onto being out somewhere in the car rather than allowing time to go home, park car and walk to the school.	The Council has a role to play in encouraging changes in behaviour to help reduce travel by unsustainable means	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				Education The 'Vision' is simple, but not so simple i.e. i) The maintenance of Rougham VC Primary School with the increase of classes when the area becomes two-tier. ii) Increased co-operation between the Rougham VC Primary School and other local schools, but that co-operation not to be limited to the joint headship with Woolpit.	The Parishes vision is noted	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	All good aspirations. Using facilities outside school hours - we believe there could be H&S and insurance issues? Parking outside schools has always been an issue - as in Horringer, but unless schools and police take the initiative then this will always be a problem.	Noted - the Council recognises that there are health and safety implications which need to be considered when offering facilities out of school hours. Some schools address this issue and overcome any barriers. The Council and partners would benefit from learning from best practice.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Travelling to and from Clare Primary School and Stour Valley Community School remains a major issue in spite of dedicated work undertaken by the schools and CPC Highways committee. Future expansion of both schools seems likely by 2031 and will need to be planned for. Issues of parking, safe walking routes through the town and crossing busy roads to get to school will become more pressing. The siting of a development on the Cavendish road poses particular safety problems for children accessing the Primary school (see letter).	Issues in relation to the site at Cavendish Road will be considered in relation to the impact of that site. Specific school related issues will need to be looked at by the School.	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	Yes - subject to the proposed amendment to draft Policy RVa (Question 18, above).	Agree that the policy could be worded more positively	Amend policy wording to read 'Development will be considered favourably where...
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society agrees with the aspirations and actions for education.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	Yes, but you need to do more to link the schools with the whole community. If older people help in schools then they get to know the young and V.V.	Noted - The Council encourages the multi-use of schools for the community (for example, section 15). Section 13 of the document (crime and disorder section) focuses on the encouragement of greater understanding between the generations	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	Education establishments have argued for years on the benefits of small numbers in classrooms, bigger is not better.	As a borough Council our focus is on the most appropriate education provision. Class sizes are decided by Suffolk CC Education.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - 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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Given the county council's lead on the Suffolk-wide Skills for the Future strategy, we are pleased to see the borough council cover post-16 skills issues in this document. We welcome the reference to apprenticeships, but there is no mention of raising the participation age to 17 from 2013 onwards, and to 18 from 2015. This does not make remaining at school compulsory, but does require individuals to remain in some form of education or training post-16. Perhaps some mention in the vision of the need to create relevant provision to meet this need aligned to the needs of the local economy would be helpful. There is also perhaps a need to ensure that post-16 provision is flexible enough to meet the needs of those who might otherwise struggle to access it and best use is made of new technologies to deliver provision remotely? With the abolition of EMA and the Explore Card the rural transport issue and the need for relevant provision within easy reach for every learner is a concern.	Agree - The Council agrees that the raising of the participation age needs to be addressed.	Amend sections 17.14 and 17.15 accordingly

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Rural schools are important focus points for rural communities; they are key to the sustainability of those communities. We therefore welcome the principle of working to secure the viability of rural schools, potentially through development. This document also sets much store by the notion of schools opening up for further community usage, which (if carried out appropriately) is to be welcomed. This is largely up to the management of individual schools as to how and if this happens, but we would suggest that libraries should also be given the same strong consideration for this purpose. Lastly, whilst we feel that there is sufficient flexibility within the policy, there is scope within the supporting text of this document for further consideration of the issues posed by the emergence of Free Schools and Academies, and what this means for both our authorities for planning for school places.	Agree - The Council agrees that libraries also have a role to play for community use. Paragraph 19b (Culture and Leisure section) amended accordingly. Agree that additional text should be added around the role and impact of Free Schools and Academies	Amend paragraph 19b in culture and leisure to address the library issue. Insert new supporting text around the issues of Free Schools and Academies
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Again it will be essential to maintain adequate funding.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes	Most adult learning courses stipulate a minimum number of learners which can be difficult to meet in smaller communities.	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	Has the impact of school catchments on social cohesion been considered? For example in Ousden and Lidgate where the children go to the same primary school as other children in the area, but are separated from their peers to go to secondary school in Newmarket while the rest go to Haverhill/Clare or Bury.	School catchment areas are established by Suffolk CC	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	School transport is inadequate . Children have to stand on buses.When the schools get to big you loose the community feel.	Comments noted. School transport is provided by Suffolk CC	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes	Help with the cost of transport to higher education facilities such as colleges in Cambridge from the West Suffolk villages may increase the number of people achieving higher levels of education.	Comments noted. School transport is provided by Suffolk CC	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 19: Education and Skills aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 19a - Do you agree with our educational aspirations?	Question 19b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes	Ensure that child road safety is of high importance and enforced	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion	Support action to promote safe and active travel.	Noted - road safety and other transport measures are addressed in the travel section of this document	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	Would also like to see an action under 17.18 to encourage parents who have become "car dependent" to explore other transport options walking, cycling, car-pooling. It is often the parents that need persuasion to change rather than the kids.	Noted - the Council considers that the actions identified to deliver this aspiration do encourage alternative transport options	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januays Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes	The settings of approaches to historic settlements are of great importance and should be recognised and taken into account in any planning policy	Agree. This is evident in the policies in the joint Development Management document	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	St Edmundsbury should incorporate a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character. Clare Parish Council strongly supports the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project. Its proven success in historic and natural environment projects, together with the positive impact on tourism should justify specific inclusion. We would strongly recommend that Clare and the surrounding countryside should be protected by inclusion in the AONB and Stour Valley Project.	Clare is protected through a Conservation Area designation. Work is being undertaken to explore the potential for a national or local designation for the part of Stour Valley and Dedham Vale which lies within St Edmundsbury	Amend paragraph 18.19 to state sources of funding

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	Yes - but any policy should not put undue financial strain on those living and working in the rural community. It should be workable and flexible to take account of the overall economics of maintaining such a policy.	No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	Great Barton: The architectural design of the Hall Park and Park areas of the village should be afforded protection from development. The Avenue of Great Barton provides a distinct entrance to the village from the south and can be traced as an historic route to The Hall.	Agree that the Park in Great Barton is an area of special character and this is referred to in the Great Barton section of the document	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	More specifically, the NPPF, Core Strategy and Rural Vision policies (as amended) provide sufficient protection, whilst balancing the needs of the evolving economy.	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Rural areas warrant protection from certain activities but it should be remembered villages are working communities	No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	Areas of unique and special character need to be identified as part of a programme of rural characterisation. These areas certainly require policy recognition and protection.	Special areas of character can vary greatly from one area to another and to ensure protection for all specific designations are not being made as protection can then be judged on a case by case basis	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Aspiration 2 should recognise that there are major employment sites in the rural areas.	Jobs and Economy section references major employment sites in rural areas	Reference to major employment sites in rural areas
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	If 'our rural area is unique with many areas of unique special character' (18.11) it ought to be relatively easy to describe them. Or is this just a 'mantra'.	No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				yes	Great Barton	Agree that the Park in Great Barton is an area of special character and this is referred to in the Great Barton section of the document	None
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes	Any agricultural areas being used at present need to be protected for future generations.	Such a broad designation could not be sustained.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	Not specific areas however it is how people use them. For example a quiet walk along quiet roads/network of paths should be considered. Each example considered on its own merits/importance to the community.	No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments 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 2031 Vision. 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 polices 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. 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.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				<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> <p>They contain large, well landscaped gardens with extensive space around and between dwellings.</p> <p>Established trees and bushes and sometimes nearby or adjoining public green spaces such as grass verges, heathland or countryside, help to soften the effect of the urban area.</p> <p>The large gardens, trees/shrubs and landscape dominant forms provide valuable green access corridors for a variety of wildlife to the open countryside and a 'lung' for the urban environment.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<p>The low urban density helps to prevent excessive demand on transport and public services, reduces the impact of neighbourhood noise and helps maintain biodiversity. It can also play a useful role in assisting the Council's climate change agenda. [Taken from a report released by Environmental Protection UK, June 2010]</p> <p>There is a high demand in the local housing market for such properties.</p> <p>Protection Required for Areas of Special Character</p> <p>Having said that there are Areas of Special Character in the town [Vision, page 72 and Core Strategy, page 42, item 4.46] it would be incomprehensible not to say where they are and why they special. It also follows that anything special should have protection. The Council say that they should be protected in item 14.20 page 72 of Vision but consider that other LDF documents will provide this.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Michael Schultz					<p>Having examined all LDF documents, including the draft Development Management Policies Document, it is clear that they will provide inadequate or dubious protection, principally because they are broad instruments that can be interpreted in a number of ways, and not site or location specific. [page 10 of Vision , item 1.28].</p> <p>The low urban density helps to prevent excessive demand on transport and public services, reduces the impact of neighbourhood noise and helps maintain biodiversity. It can also play a useful role in assisting the Council's climate change agenda. [Taken from a report released by Environmental Protection UK, June 2010]</p> <p>There is a high demand in the local housing market for such properties.</p>		

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<p>Protection Required for Areas of Special Character Having said that there are Areas of Special Character in the town [Vision, page 72 and Core Strategy, page 42, item 4.46] it would be incomprehensible not to say where they are and why they special. It also follows that anything special should have protection. The Council say that they should be protected in item 14.20 page 72 of Vision but consider that other LDF documents will provide this. Having examined all LDF documents, including the draft Development Management Policies Document, it is clear that they will provide inadequate or dubious protection, principally because they are broad instruments that can be interpreted in a number of ways, and not site or location specific. [page 10 of Vision , item 1.28]. This gives the opportunity for owners/developers to exploit shortcomings in the broad policies and build a case for planning approval which, if resisted by the Council, could be attained on appeal. To properly protect things, one must surely be very specific.</p>		

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					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]. 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. Policies To Prevent Unsuitable Development The designation should be accompanied with policies that ensure minimal change occurs to the area and environmental qualities are protected. These should include:	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<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> <p>Conversions of houses to flats or for commercial use will not be acceptable.</p> <p>Creation of access roads through plots in order to develop land within, beyond or adjacent to the area will not be acceptable.</p> <p>Alterations, extensions, annexes etc to be allowed provided they follow policy 24 of the Draft DPD.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz					<p>Many Councils have designated [Residential] Areas of Special Character and introduced policies for protection similar to the foregoing. They play a major role in maintaining the attractiveness of the Town. Without them, the Borough would be poorer and consist principally of high density housing with small gardens and no residential or landscape character. This is linked with residents' No. 1 concern from the last round of consultation [Item 1.30. Page 10 of Vision] that 'there is concern that the town will be over-developed and that crowded housing will result'</p> <p>Hall Park, Great Barton. This area has a distinct character and meets the criteria laid out above. It was also named as a suitable area in Item 6 of our petition/ application document.</p> <p>There are likely to be other suitable areas within the small rural towns and villages, which should be identified by local residents and the Council.</p>	Agree that the Park in Great Barton is an area of special character and this is referred to in the Great Barton section of the document	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment to make on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				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.	Implementation for GI projects is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	References made in the IDP
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	All parts of the rural area need protection; current policy threatens to allow the growth of towns or sub-urban development of villages without special character. For those of us who live in them their very existence is special, whatever outsiders or the more fortunate living in conservation areas may think.	Such a broad designation could not be sustained.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21088E	Simon Amstutz	Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project			no	The Stour Valley should be included as an Area of Special Character. St Edmundsbury Borough Council already recognise the importance of the Stour Valley elsewhere in the document and through being a founding member of the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project Partnership. St Edmundsbury Borough Council recognised the importance of the area by signing up to the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Management Plan 2010-15 and further protection through the LDF/Areas of Special Character of this area would be welcome	Clare is protected through a Conservation Area designation. Work is being undertaken to explore the potential for a national or local designation for the part of Stour Valley and Dedham Vale which lies within St Edmundsbury	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				no	No	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes	As mentioned above, The greenfield site proposed for development of 20 houses in Risby spoils the edge of the village & would surround traditional farm barn conversions with development based purely on commercial greed.	This is an objection to a specific development site and is dealt with in the context of the Risby village section of the document	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	Not in Great Barton	the Park in Great Barton is an area of special character and this is referred to in the Great Barton section of the document	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				yes	The footpath beside our property is used by quite responsible walkers and dog owners. It is a beautiful walkway out into the fields and beyond. Frogs cross our garden to the ditch ever year. Wild primroses fill the banks which our neighbours maintain. Our beautiful hedges surround our property and are a landmark in the village and part f planning consent a pedestrian footway will destroy the beauty and tranquillity of this path, The hedgerows support wildlife from squirrels, woodpeckers, owls deer roam behind us which we watch and bats are a joy on an evening to sit and watch this is a wildlife haven which will be destroyed. The hedgerows are the landscape and provide privacy to us all.	No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough					Rushbrooke, Westly Cattishall / Great Barton, Fornham. These are all villages that are now under TOTAL threat from Town sprawl with not enough respect to land given as divides as per Core Strategy to maintain their individual identity ETC for the benefit for the future	Such a broad designation could not be sustained.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 20: Unique and Special Character

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 20a - Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?	Question 20b - Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special and unique character?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	There are plenty of other protection mechanisms in place already	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes	Great Barton: The architectural design of the Hall Park and Park areas of the village should be afforded protection from development. The Avenue of Great Barton provides a distinct entrance to the village from the south and can be traced as an historic route to The Hall.	The Park in Great Barton is an area of special character and this is referred to in the Great Barton section of the document	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		No specific areas have been identified.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes	Clare Parish Council agree with the Historic and Natural Environment aspirations, however successful delivery would be heavily dependent upon significant co-operation from landowners.	Funding for GI policies comes from government growth area funding and developer contributions where appropriate.	Make a reference to this in the supporting text.
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	The preservation of Green Lane in Great Barton is an historic route which should be afforded preservation.	This is a public route. Development to the south of the route will be considered as part of the north east Bury St Edmunds strategic site.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no	We agree to the principle of Green Infrastructure provision, but, in accordance with Chapter 11 of the NPPF, access and permeability to green infrastructure should not unacceptably impact upon the wider benefits of such ecosystems or harm the very environment the public seek to visit and enjoy.	Agree with statement. The policy accords with this.	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	I find this question very hypocritical.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications below in b). We like to see the green infrastructure protected, but we are not certain all these improvements are really necessary. Also, who pays for such improvements? Such costs should not fall to the council tax payer. Development of the order proposed is unlikely to improve the green infrastructure.	Funding for GI policies comes from government growth area funding and developer contributions where appropriate.	Make a reference to this in the supporting text.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council welcomes a policy which seeks to deliver on the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				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.	Funding for GI policies comes from government growth area funding and developer contributions where appropriate.	Make a reference to this in the supporting text.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes	<p>Providing safe cycle routes is an excellent idea and should be a priority but will require a large amount of money and will depend on the co-operation of Suffolk County Council as well with more priority being given to rural communities.</p> <p>Rural footpaths are important for village residents and visitors. Unfortunately due to cutbacks, a lot of footpaths do not get cut regularly making them impassable in the summer.</p> <p>The cost of heating oil has risen dramatically. What systems are in place to reduce dependency on oil or to help people on low incomes? Could alternatives like solar panels be installed for people on low incomes and the money generated be ploughed back to the Borough/County Council to help fund more installations?</p>	While funding for many schemes in the rural areas is desirable the economic climate is such that the council is not in a provision to provide it. Alternative sources of funding may be available.	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	All hedgerows and natural drainage ditches need to be protected they serve a purpose to wildlife and stop flooding on the fields taking the water away. We need to encourage people to enjoy not destroy and ruin what we appreciate and worked hard to achieve.	The Council has no control over private land.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 21: Green Infrastructure (RV5)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 21a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?	Question 21b - If not, please set out any changes you would like to see.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no	A more realistic approach to development in areas of special character	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes	Preserve Green Lane - and historic religious route	This is a public route. Development to the south of the route will be considered as part of the north east Bury St Edmunds strategic site.	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council					This issue has been dealt with in Joint Development Management document. Agree that additional text can be inserted around biodiversity. There is no specific objective around biodiversity as this is clearly set out in Core Strategy Objective H.	Make reference in this section to the SPA in relation to biodiversity and habitats.
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				Breckland Council objects to both the Rural and Bury St Edmunds Vision on the grounds of a lack of a policy and monitoring framework on the potential impact of development in the Borough on protected European Sites through recreational and urban effects in combination with other plans and programmes.	See above	See above
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15784	Janet Nuttall CEnv MIEEM	Natural England				<p>Thank you for your letter dated 29th February 2012 consulting Natural England on the above LDF Preferred Options Publication. 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>	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall CEnv MIEEM	Natural England				<p>The document needs to replace reference to the draft NPPF with reference to the NPPF; the newly adopted document includes key amendments, including greater protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Section 11 of the NPPF provides useful guidance for local authorities in preparing Local Plans which will contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment</p> <p>This document recognises the importance of the natural environment for people and wildlife, seeking to ensure that all new development will respect Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We would recommend that this wording is 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>	Agree that references to NPPF need updating	References to draft NPPF updated

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall CEnv MIEEM	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> <p>We welcome proposals to protect, maintain and enhance the natural environment, including designated sites and areas of local importance for wildlife. We particularly welcome proposals to promote the management, understanding of and connectivity between these areas and to engage the local community. The section on green infrastructure recognises the need to plan positively for green infrastructure as part of sustainable development and climate change mitigation and adaptation. We are pleased that GI, as part of development, will seek to be multi-functional and be based on the objectives and aspirations of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, including the need for high quality GI linkages.</p>	Agree that reference to GI should be updated	Make reference 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.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall CEnv MIEEM	Natural England				<p>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> <p>Sustainability Appraisal The Sustainability Appraisal identifies the potential for a number of policies / sites to have negative impacts on European sites and/or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). The Appraisal identifies the need for amendments to policy wording to ensure development fully considers the potential for significant effects on these sites and is subject to further assessment/project level HRA where required.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal also identifies 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.</p>	Comments are noted	The Sustainability Appraisal process acknowledges the importance of biodiversity under SA Objective 16

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Janet Nuttall CEnv MIEEM	Natural England				<p>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> <p>We therefore recommend that the Plan should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>We have been unable to look at all the sites / policies in detail hence we would recommend that the Plan is cross-referenced with the Sustainability Appraisal to identify where policy rewording is required to address potential impacts on European sites, SSSIs, local sites and habitats and species.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>We are generally satisfied with the methodology and assessment presented in the report and believe this is in line with the requirements of the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010.</p>	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker			no opinion	<p>The assessment identifies the potential for two policies in the Rural Vision 2031 to have a significant effect on European sites; these are RV4 Protection of Special Uses which could give rise to impacts on Breckland SAC as the policy fails to make reference to this European site and policy RV16 Hopton which, through the development it promotes, could lead to significant effects on the Waveney-Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC, as a result of foul drainage and increased visitor pressure. We agree with the recommended additional wording within both of these policies and supporting text which will ensure that the Plan will not have an adverse effect on European sites. The recommended changes to the Plan will need to be implemented to enable the HRA to satisfactorily conclude that the Plan will not have an adverse effect on the Waveney-Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC.</p>	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			yes	You should refer to our response to the Core Strategy for further comments on specific policies and sites.	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes	Yes - but how is this to be delivered? Since when has the footpath/byway/green lane network been properly maintained?	The delivery of the aspirations and actions will require close working with many different organisations	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	With particular regard to development.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			yes	The Society agrees with the aspirations and actions for the natural and historic environment and the proposed actions.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				yes	You make the point (18.21) that rural roads lack pavements, but no action to remedy this is mentioned beyond 'rights of way' and 'work with landowners'.	Noted - reference is made to working with partners to improve the footpath and cycle network	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell					I find this question very hypocritical.	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	18.22 Very important Cycling promotion/enhancement for today's children - Future adults influence own children	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes	Yes but with qualifications below in b). We like to see the green infrastructure protected, but we are not certain all these improvement are really necessary. Also, who pays for such improvements? Such costs should not fall to the council tax payer. Development of the order proposed is unlikely to improve the green infrastructure.	Funding for GI policies comes from government growth area funding and developer contributions where appropriate.	Amend paragraph 18.19 to state sources of funding

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	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 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Aspiration 3 is welcomed. Any proposals to develop areas of new green space, and green infrastructure, should consider the historic landscape character and use, to ensure that these are in keeping with, and respect, historic land use, and historic land boundaries and divisions. This can be achieved by the appropriate assessment of the historic landscape at an early stage in any development plans to ensure historic landscape features are - wherever possible - maintained, enhanced and promoted. 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).	Comments are noted	No changes required
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				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 18 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. 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.	Agreed	New action on promoting visitor access inserted

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	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				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). 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.	Noted - the delivery plan will identify specific actions and responsibilities. This may address the issues about robustness of the actions. Work is being undertaken to explore the potential for a national or local designation for the part of Stour Valley and Dedham Vale which lies within St Edmundsbury	New paragraph inserted around work being undertaken on Stour Valley/Dedham Vale.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				yes	Again, care needs to be given to protecting and enhancing those aspect which may not be historic in English Heritage, National Trust, Suffolk Preservation or CPRE terms but have important local significance, if only because they are all that the local population has.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	the proposal next to our home is a pedestrian way. this is a natural footpath which people enjoy walking along to access to the fields and wildlife beyond. It will become a public thoroughfare destroying its beauty and our privacy.	The council has no control over the level of use of public footpaths.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes	Maintaining the green corridor is very important - children are taught in school about ecological issues and it is important that they are able to see natural habitats in their village	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 22: Historic and Natural Environment aspirations

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 22a - Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?	Question 22b - Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15747	Gordon Smith	Matrix Planning Ltd	Mr John W Roberts and family	Church Farm	no	Object. Proposing a new 18ha site for 150 homes/employment adjacent to the Primary School. Summary of objection to current sites: To the south of the village (RV6b & c) Two sites at 'Barrow Hill' to the south of the village will provide an additional 150 residential dwellings. The sites will perform poorly in environmental aspects, as they seek to develop Greenfield land. It is really no different in sustainability measure to the present site at Church Farm Land adjacent to the primary school (Site Allocation Reference 6.1d)	This site is remote from the village, is not adjacent to the housing settlement boundary and is not in an opportunity area for new development in the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. There are other more suitable sites in the village which are better related to the village's services and facilities which fall within identified areas of opportunity.	No changes required
	Gordon Smith	Matrix Planning Ltd	Mr John W Roberts and family	Church Farm		The site is located at the northern end of the village away from the Housing Settlement Boundary. Against some of the sustainability objectives the site did perform poorly. It is located on Greenfield/agricultural land. This area has been proposed to offer employment opportunities to the Key Service Centre of Barrow and will aid to reduce work travel distances for inhabitants. Church Farm offers an opportunity with the cooperation of the landowner to relocate this site further to the north as part of a comprehensive employment development. See supporting information/plans submitted.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				(a)No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. (b) & (c) 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).	Noted. The requirement for archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
RVR15794	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				Agree in part. The response to this question has been set out under the key headings below. Support for Allocation of Land to the East of Barrow Hill The allocation of land to the east of Barrow Hill, Barrow to provide an indicative capacity of 75 dwellings is strongly supported. The Council has correctly identified that the site benefits from being well- related to the existing development boundary of Barrow and therefore is a suitable site for development. It is also considered that the evidence submitted to the Council as part of the last round of consultation demonstrated that the development is fully deliverable and responds to some of the key issues raised by residents in the early rounds of consultation. This includes the provision of maintaining the village character, with the integration of open space fronting onto Barrow Hill and the provision of sustainable urban drainage techniques to minimise run- off from the development.	The phasing of land east and west of Barrow Hill needs to fall in the medium term due to the need for improvements to waste water treatment works to serve the village.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				<p>If the proposals come forward on Barrow Hill provision will also be made to improve pedestrian links with the village.</p> <p>Phasing of the Development</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of Barrow Hill is strongly supported, the rationale for phasing of the developments has not been fully justified. The early delivery of land at Barrow Hill would provide a number of benefits for the village. This includes the early delivery of a dental surgery for villagers and also provision of affordable housing to meet the identified shortfall within Barrow. Phasing- Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework At present the phasing strategy for Barrow is not considered to be fully compliant with the NPPF in that it does not provide adequate provision for competition and supply of market land in Barrow over the plan period. In the longer term (post 2021) there will be adequate competition for land with 150 of Barrow's proposed 179 dwellings to come forward.</p>	See above	See above
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				<p>This only allows for 29 dwellings to be completed in Barrow in the short term (2011- 2021) on a single development, with no other competition from other sites. It also creates an in- balance in the projected growth in Barrow over the plan period with 84% of the development due to come forward after 2021.</p> <p>Phasing- Affordable Housing</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) identifies a shortfall of 795 affordable houses in St Edmundsbury. The best method of addressing this shortfall is the early delivery of market lead housing schemes, which also make provision for delivery of on - site affordable housing as an integral part of the development. With reference to rural areas the SHMA has identified the lack of affordable housing in rural areas as a key issue undermining the sustainability of communities in these areas.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				The SHMA states that young people are moving away from family and friends because housing within the villages are not affordable. Within Barrow 78% of houses are owner occupied, with 9% private rented. This leaves only 11% of houses to be social rented, with no shared ownership properties. It is clear from the SHMA that Barrow is in need of the delivery of affordable housing to meet the needs of local people, who cannot afford to buy in Barrow. To deliver this provision, the Council should give consideration to the early delivery of housing at land to the East of Barrow Hill for development Support for Bringing Forward Timescale for Development at Land to the East of Barrow Hill To address the problems outlined above, it is considered that the Council should give consideration to bringing forward the timescale for the development of land to the east of Barrow Hill immediately, rather than after 2021.	See above	See above
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				This would allow for the early delivery of the land and provision of affordable housing to meet local demand. It will also help maintain a supply of competition for market land over the early part of the plan period. In the event that the Council did not want to allocate all of the land for development at this stage, consideration could be given to the phased delivery of land at Barrow Hill. The phased delivery could provide an immediate allocation for 40 dwellings to come forward in the short term at the start of the plan period, with a further 35 dwellings proposed later in the plan period after 2021.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	David Fletcher	Strutt and Parker				The possible phasing areas are shown on the attached plan 2011-158 SCA. This would allow some affordable housing to be delivered to meet the identified shortfall in Barrow and provision of a dental surgery at an early stage of the process. It would also allow the Council to maintain almost half of the growth on the site until after 2021, to ensure the phased delivery of development over the plan period. In any event, Strutt and Parker and the applicant welcome the allocation of land at east of Barrow Hill and are generally in full support of the allocations for Barrow.	See above	See above
RVR15819	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Suffolk based Hopkins Homes Ltd is an award winning premium housing developer with a contractual agreement to promote residential led development at Site RV6c in Barrow, west of Barrow Hill. The company has a track record of delivering some of the best new development built in Suffolk and has won a prestigious Gold Award at the National What House Awards in November 2011. Its sensitive design-led approach to development projects creates a benchmark for quality and place-making in St Edmundsbury and throughout the region.	Noted	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Hopkins Homes Ltd has formulated detailed development proposals for site RV6c and would be for submission as a planning application. The proposed planning application will be submitted with full technical explanation and justification. The primitive sketch of the site contained in the Rural Vision document is not explained or justified but the Hopkins Homes Ltd plans have been the subject of consultation and will be fully explained via a Design and Access Statement and other comprehensive planning documentation. The Hopkins Homes Ltd layout plan and consultation report are attached as Appendices to this Response Statement.	The indicative plans are included within the document to give some clarity to the site requirements	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The developer and landowner are able to confirm that there are no technical or infrastructure constraints which would delay the delivery of the site. The local primary school has several vacant places, now occupied, through parental choice, by children residing in Bury St Edmunds. Furthermore, sewerage infrastructure is available with renewal works undertaken by the developer (paragraph 20.8 j and k). The indicated desire for public footpath connections from the site to link to the extent of the existing footway network in the village is noted and concurred with. As part of Hopkins Homes proposals for the development of the site, a new footway is proposed from the site frontage, running along the western side of Barrow Hill, before connecting with the existing footway network at the southern entrance to Johnson Road.	The phasing of land east and west of Barrow Hill needs to fall in the medium term due to the need for improvements to waste water treatment works to serve the village.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The current planning position here dictates that the Rural Vision document should be either a Local Plan or an Area Action Plan but, as drafted, it appears to fall outside of either category. The phrase 'Area Action Plan' appears twice in the Rural Vision document, but only in reference to the two other Rural Vision documents for Haverhill and Bury. There is no express reference in the Rural Vision to the effect that it would eventually be submitted to the Secretary of State in the form of an 'Area Action Plan'.	Agree that this needs to be clarified	Update the front end of the document to reflect the NPPF

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				It would appear that the site allocation process, according to historical consultation and data collection and the Council's Local Development Scheme, will take a 6 year period from 2008 to 2014. Given that 2 years have passed since the site was 'allocated' in a Council's April 2010 Preferred Options document, it is alarming that paragraph 1.10 of the Rural Vision Document states 'this is still an early stage in developing the vision'. During the interregnum between April 2010 and 2012 Hopkins Homes has been advancing its plan preparation while the policy making process has remained static such that the Core Strategy is yet to achieve any development progress. Hopkins Homes Ltd will be submitting a planning application in the short term.'	The preparation of the Vision documents superseded the preparation of the site allocations document following the change in government and direction of planning policy.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Although much of the local Visions are to be applauded, there is a national return to recession, and given the collapse of new housing supply at a time of greatest housing need, it is perhaps time to focus on the delivery of sustainable development rather than the pioneering of new elongated planning processes. As is clear from the previous 'Vision 2025' process instigated by the Borough Council in 2005 there is a greater need to focus on deliverable outcomes rather than more policy words. Here, Hopkins Homes is guaranteeing an excellent, inclusive, sustainable and enduring development and can promise completion of the site in the period to 2016 without any public funding.	The preparation of the Vision documents is a statutory requirement.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Looking at the site specific policy wording for Barrow, first published in April 2010, this states that the development is due to be first occupied in 2021 and beyond. Hopkins Homes Limited objects to the statement that 'Residential development on these sites will be permitted in accordance with the phasing period shown' .This time-delay and artificial restraint has not been justified at all. The only constraint here is the planning process itself. Such is the institutional acceptance of 'delay' it is noteworthy that the unjustified 2021 date is referred to by the Borough Council as 'medium term' whereas, in the 2010 Core Strategy, this date signifies 'long term'.	Agree that the removal of specific phasing dates will ensure the document aligns with the NPPF	Delete the words 'after 2021' in the policy box.
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The unjustified 'process based' delay in respect of a site which has been the subject of several rounds of consultation (including consultation instigated by the developer and landowner) is in complete conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which has been published since the latest rural consultation commenced. The NPPF states 'Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay - a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision.' Furthermore, paragraph 14 of the NPPF emphasises that Local Planning Authorities should already be 'approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission'.	The NPPF is still promoting a plan led system whereby sites are allocated before planning permission can be approved.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Paragraph 15 states 'Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay'. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF signals the government's intention to 'To boost significantly the supply of housing'. Paragraph 182 states 'local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible'.	The Vision documents are being prepared as quickly as possible within the remit of the planning regulations and current resources.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The Inspector's Report in respect of the Core Strategy confirmed that 'Phasing should be dealt with in more detail in the AAP and it may be that specific dates can be justified in that context. In the meantime, for the plan to be effective I am recommending changes' The specific changes were to delete the 2021 date in respect of two major development sites at Bury St Edmunds. It is nonsensical that an artificial date has again been proposed, without explanation, so soon after this approach has been found unsound in the context of the Core Strategy.	Agree that the removal of specific phasing dates will ensure the document aligns with the NPPF	Delete the words 'after 2021' in the policy box.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The statement in the draft Policy that 'Applications for planning permission will only be considered once the Development Briefs have been agreed by the local planning authority' would unreasonably further delay the development and serve no useful planning purpose. Recent experiences in St Edmundsbury have shown that the submission, and agreement, of Development Briefs adds another year and significant cost to the process without providing any benefit to the development outcome. Where a single use, single access development, is proposed on a greenfield site, with no physical, ecological, technical or other constraints, a Development Brief would have no useful purpose. This is even more pertinent given the tight control of development via very detailed development management policies the public expectation that a planning application is being formulated following the public consultation event to which the whole village was invited back in July 2011.	A development brief is required due to the level of development being proposed on this site and the site east of Barrow Hill.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				This view of Development Briefs is backed up by Government research and advice. 'Planning and Development Briefs: A Guide to Better Practice' 'A planning brief may not be necessary where: i the development plan together with any supplementary planning guidance provides an adequate basis for determining a planning application, taking all site-related factors into account; ii the local authority has no firm requirements for the site; or iii acceptable proposals are anticipated or are already being discussed with developers (e.g. where standard approaches to development are thought to be acceptable or where an acceptable planning application has been submitted).	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The cost and time involved in preparing a planning brief should always be compared against the likely cost and time of securing acceptable development without it. The survey of users of briefs (developers, landowners, etc), conducted as part of the research, suggested that even when developers submit a proposal which fully complies with a planning brief, they may still have to go through a lengthy negotiation period over the planning application. The resources spent preparing such briefs may not reduce the amount of resources spent in negotiation, casting doubt on the utility of the brief.	See above	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				As previously stated, the developer will submit a full Design and Access Statement with its planning application demonstrating that the development will be premium quality and highly sustainable. Comments regarding Land east of Barrow Hill, Site RV6b The appropriateness of the land area suggested to be allocated as Site RV6b is questioned, given the lack of previous consultation undertaken in respect of this site and the conflict with existing landscape and physical features which would result from such an artificially created site. The reason for dismissing site 6.1b as set out in Appendix 6 to the rural vision is not justified.	The site lies within an opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. The IECA study verifies that Barrow has the capacity for all of the sites being proposed up to 2031.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The area of land suggested currently forms the south-western and north-western-most corners of two much larger agricultural fields, currently separated by substantial field hedging, with no obvious vehicular access available to the northern-most parcel. The suggested access routes as proposed within the Policy would appear to require third-party land and property removal, which itself is also questionable. The statement within paragraph 20.15 that this site is 'better related to the built form of Barrow and to the existing services and facilities in the village' appears to be based more upon the creation of a pleasant shape on the map than what is both desirable and achievable in reality on the ground. The site does not benefit from the public endorsement and planning provenance of the Barrow Green and West of Barrow Hill sites.	The site lies within an opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. The IECA study verifies that Barrow has the capacity for all of the sites being proposed up to 2031.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				The Barrow Green site RV6a has been submitted as a planning application. This application includes a wider site area such that the net increase in dwellings there is now 37. Furthermore the West of Barrow Hill site RV6c has a capacity of 80 dwellings. Both sites are proposing affordable housing to satisfy local housing needs in accord with Core Strategy Policy CS5. Whilst the proximity of the newly suggested site RV6b to the existing Doctors Surgery would potentially suggest the suitability of the location for a Dental Surgery, it is considered that there are a number of more appropriate sites available around the village to accommodate any additional housing growth, together with further public open space, required in excess of that being provided upon sites RV6a and RV6c. In this respect, it would appear that the wording of Paragraph 20.4 and, subsequently, that contained within Paragraph 20.5 (e) is potentially placing unnecessary constraints upon the appropriate consideration of other sites to accommodate what would be longer-term growth requirements.	Site RV6b is an identified development opportunity area in the 2009 Infrastructure and Capacity Appraisal.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				Whilst acknowledging the desire to prevent the coalescence between the separate historic Parishes of Barrow and neighbouring Denham, there should be no such restriction between the eastern and western areas of the village. For clarification, Burthorpe Green, Sharpes Hill & Papeley Meadow are all part of the village of Barrow, already linked to the remainder of the village by development along the northern side of Bury Road, hence any future longer-term growth which substantiates this linkage should be encouraged rather than prevented.	Barrow village is made of two parts, the eastern most part of which can be referred to as Burthorpe. The separation between these two parts of the village is important and the distinctive break in development maintained.	No changes required
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				While sites RV6a and RV6c are being initiated sustainably and responsibly by a high quality development company supported by active and willing land owners the same cannot be said for site RV6b. That site was first mooted by a letter from a company called Pen and Cane Associates. Rather than demonstrating the track record of delivering sustainable development that Hopkins Homes Ltd is renowned for, Pen and Cane is listed as small recruitment company operating from a semi detached house in Ipswich with 6 'likes' on Facebook. Clearly such roots do not assist with the NPPF demand that allocated sites must be deliverable and: 'To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.'	Site RV6b was a site submitted to the Council for development and as such is considered available and deliverable.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes				In Summary it is requested that the following changes be made to Policy RV6 and its associated plan and text: Delete 'Residential development on these sites will be permitted in accordance with the phasing period shown'. i Delete - the words '(after 2021)' in Policy RV6c. ii Delete - the words 'and (c)' from the statement 'On sites (b) and (c) the amount of land available for development, location of uses, access arrangements, design and landscaping will be informed by Development Briefs for the sites. Applications for planning permission will only be considered once the Development Briefs have been agreed by the local planning authority.' iii Delete the primitive site plan from page 59. (See attached Barrow Feedback sheet and presentation).	See above comments	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15825	Sue Houlder	Barrow cum Denham Parish Council				Barrow cum Denham Parish Council would like to make the following comments regarding the consultation document on Rural Vision 2031: If the developments on land east of Barrow Hill and land west of Barrow (RV6b and RV 6C) are kept in the Rural Vision 2031 then we ask that a minimum of two years is left between the finish of one development and the start of the other development. We ask that one development be classed as medium term development and the other development be classed as long term development. During the two years, before the second development goes ahead, we ask that a traffic impact assessment and an overall assessment on housing need be carried out. The Parish Council wish the comments made in 20.8 of the Rural Vision document to stand in its entirety.	Phasing is required to ensure that a steady supply of land is available over a 5 year period and that infrastructure constraints are adequately dealt with which in the case of Barrow is the lack of capacity at the waste water treatment works. Suffolk County Council have stated that there is not school capacity for the development proposed and the developer contributions will be required.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sue Houlder	Barrow cum Denham Parish Council				<p>It is a real possibility that the village primary school will become an Academy in the near future. Councillors feel that there then could be an issue in the future regarding capacity and expansion of the school becoming a real issue, especially if Suffolk County Council refuse to help. How would this be handled in the LDF? The Parish Council are aware that another landowner wishes to add a site to the plan and is coming to speak to Councillors in June. This site would be an extension of RV3a and run along Church Road.</p> <p>The Parish Council would not wish to see any development to the West of The Street in Barrow. The Parish Council wish you to be aware that they will be putting together a Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Parish Council (RV6a) are concerned about the number of dwellings on Watsons Land on The Green. In your Policy RV6 Barrow you indicated that the capacity would be 29 dwellings and that a Development Brief was adopted in March 2011 (20.14). In literature distributed by Hopkins Homes it mentions in the proposals 40 homes plus 30% affordable housing.</p>	The site which is an extension of RV3a is remote from the village, is not adjacent to the housing settlement boundary and is not in an opportunity area for new development in the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. There are other more suitable sites in the village which are better related to the village's services and facilities which fall within identified areas of opportunity. The Development Brief for the site is for 29 dwellings.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sue Houlder	Barrow cum Denham Parish Council				<p>I enclose a copy of this literature for information. Surely the development must accord with the adopted development brief?</p> <p>In 20.5 and 20.6 you mention the constraints on Barrow Waste Water Treatment Works and that it will require additional capacity by 2020. You also mention surface water flooding and we would urge you to investigate the village infrastructure before any planning applications are submitted. We would also urge you to ensure that we are able to have a faster broadband connection in the village.</p> <p>We agree with the statement made in 20.4 and 20.5b that the close proximity of the small settlement of Denham should be protected from coalescence with Barrow.</p> <p>We agree with the statement made in 20.4 that the close proximity of the small settlement of Burthorpe should be protected from coalescence with Barrow.</p> <p>Barrow cum Denham Parish Council do hope that the points above will be taken into consideration in the final document of Rural Vision 2031. (See attached plan of proposals for The Green by Hopkins Homes)</p>	<p>The additional 11 dwellings are being proposed on the site of existing buildings which is not included within the Development Brief. The aspirations to produce a neighbourhood plan are noted which would need to be produced with the assistance of the borough council</p> <p>Comments are noted</p>	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15831	Will and Sophie Stanton				yes	<p>I write in response to the Rural Vision 2031 as it relates to the proposed allocation of site RV6c (Formerly site 6.1c) for residential development.</p> <p>Barrow is a sustainable and accessible Key Service Centre with mandatory minimum levels of growth provided for as part of the adopted Core Strategy. It is clearly of a size and community capacity to be able to sustain additional new housing which, in turn, will support local facilities and services and increase the supply, affordability and range of family housing.</p> <p>The West of Barrow Hill site is the best opportunity to achieve the necessary housing growth in Barrow and, as land owner here we have teamed up with renowned local developer Hopkins Homes Ltd to deliver this site. As a resident of the locality it is important to me that the site provides a lasting legacy in terms of its design and quality and Hopkins Homes Ltd has a demonstrable track record in this regard in St Edmundsbury Borough and beyond.</p>	This support is welcomed	No changes required
	Will and Sophie Stanton					<p>The provision of a high quality development including affordable housing designed in a sympathetic, sustainable, and inclusive way will be an enduring and attractive addition to the village. I am aware of their representations in relation to the Rural Vision and I clearly share their concern about unwarranted delay to this project. There was a successful consultation event last year to which all of the residents of Barrow, Burthorpe and Denham were invited and there is a positive momentum here which does not favour delay.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Will and Sophie Stanton					<p>I share Hopkins Homes Ltd's aspirations that this will be an excellent development. However, we agree that the delivery of a greenfield site for a single use would be unreasonably delayed in the event that the policy retained its insistence that a Development Brief be prepared and approved. The Rural Vision Area Action Plan is not expected to be adopted until the middle of 2014 and this delay to the planning process cannot be tolerated particularly in view of the Government's intention to 'boost the supply of housing'. The new NPPF states 'Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay - a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision'. The NPPF also emphasises that 'Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay'.</p> <p>Hopkins Homes Ltd will be refining its plans for further pre-application discussions with a view to submitting an application for full planning permission</p>	A development brief is required due to the level of development being proposed on this site and the site east of Barrow Hill.	No changes required
						Hopkins Homes Ltd will be refining its plans for further pre-application discussions with a view to submitting an application for full planning permission this year.	see above	
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Noted	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15885	Mr A Larwood	Pen & Cane				Pen & Cane. Project 128. Barrow. Phase 1. Proposal for housing development of 120+ dwellings by 2016. Phase 2 until 2031. Presented 30th April 2012. The expertise and interest that this project has gained over nearly three years is so inspiring that it has become the leading project in the UK bringing Localism into the lives of the public. Mostly concerning the future of housing developments in villages, not just in West Suffolk or East Anglia, but across the nation. It has brought inspiration not just within Whitehall or No10, but many top offices across the country but also within the rest of Europe and even further. This model is exceptionally good for the residents of such villages, because they are the leading party in the development, because of their total involvement in the design and planning of the future of the community.	Noted. The site proposed as a whole is too large to be considered for development as a whole. Part of the site proposed is an allocated site and is being promoted by Strutt and Parker (Ref RVR15794).	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					'With the residents, for the residents', Enhancing the environmental issues of said villages, with the community gaining from the development with new ideas and using tried and trusted but rarely used plans for common ownership, formatting the earning potential of the village and so much more. To the point that a legal team is looking at using this as a way to introduce new standards within policy. Using the latest plans for housing, services and the future of the homes created, with the latest technology used in all instances.	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					Pen and Cane only use developers who build to the highest levels of quality and exceeds all the standards, guidelines and policies that apply. The site is on the Hargrave road on Barrow hill and extends behind existing housing. See site location and plan attached. The residents will back this project totally because of all the advantages to the village that will happen during the development program. Also there may well be some points that have not even been raised before, that are included in this proposal. That's simply because unlike this company, others do not put as much thought into people's feelings about where their homes are and the consequences developments like this have on their lives. This model is laid out to follow the forty homes that have already been granted planning permission in Barrow to work in unison with that development. There will also be our responses to questions that you may not have been asked, but the locals think is important.	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					We have even taken advice from advisers and consultants to the secretary of state's office, to the authors of government policy on planning, design, new technology and green matters. Including the Author of the LDF policy who then went onto write the policy that the Conservative government introduce that you are all now working to, with the help of the members of Acumen 7 group and so many more	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Social.</p> <p>The site model ticks all the boxes in this matter and adds so much more.</p> <p>It will be the input from the young of the village that determines what amenities they would like to have in their community, when we first asked questions about this issue, it was a Skate park that was chosen. It is more of an activity area that is being asked for with a more varied intension than just skateboards and the like.</p> <p>Tennis or Basketball courts and a five a side pitch will be built for use by the general public, with a parking and viewing area.</p> <p>Picnic benches will be put in place at a position so that a view of the whole of the meadows and woods area can be enjoyed.</p> <p>A donation will be made to each of the churches within the parish and some of the adjoining villages.</p>	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Consultation will go on with the residents and staff of the small old peoples care home within the village and donations made to satisfy any requests.</p> <p>The residents of Denham will also benefit in their chosen way upon final consultation.</p> <p>Certain areas of the meadows will be made for public use for the enjoyment of all residents. Hence the re-introduction of the old concept of common ownership. But we want to make the concept work in this proposal for the empowering of the residents in this village.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Common ownership. To protect the overall size and to allow for further growth in Barrow before 2031. We also the want to emphasise the whole rural vision concept idea. With making the use of the ownership arrangement for the village, then we will be able to earn each month from the rental of common ownership property. We will set with the developer the parameters of this build with the residents requirements included right from the onset. Let's say for every 60th home built, the village get 1 dwelling. So with the first phase of this development the residents will own 2 new rental properties in Barrow, all income gained from the new standards set in this model, will go straight into the village fund, on a monthly or quarterly basis. Another part of the common ownership scheme will enable the residents to set the limit of growth of the village down the Barrow hill.</p>	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Also this common land can be rented out as a farming asset with income, again going in to the Village fund. May I even suggest that within a few years the residents make it know that we would look to purchase the land opposite the entrance to this site on the Denham side of the road, to ensure that more growth does not head towards Denham, keeping its own village identity more secure and the residents statement made. They are in control of the future of their village.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					Environmental The big winner out of this whole project is the flora and fauna of this area, we have extensive knowledge of this matter, myself being the Author of the Nature news the monthly article in the parish magazine. With this knowledge and contacts we will be establishing a large area of meadow land, woods, hedgerows and maybe ponds. Included in the green plan for this area, there will be a dog walking path, a public footpath that will connect with the existing footpath to Willsummer wood from the Harwgrave road that is next to our meadowland, providing a walk around the whole site.	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					Within this area will be areas of clover for the Honeybees, also nesting boxes of all kinds for the Birds and bat boxes too. This whole area will be planted with a considerable amount of trees, including some arboretum type specimens. It is very important for our butterflies and other insects are taken into consideration, with the fact that there are quite simply more flowering shrubs and bushes needed around our own habitat. To aid this, a considerable amount of landscaping around the development with breaks across the meadowland, including lots of wildflower seeding going on. The planning for the meadowland area will take into consideration any advice from the department concerned with the Green Infrastructure study. The BTO will also be very involved and they may even use project 128 as a case study for reference in the future in other sites.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					<p>There will also be places for picnic benches and tables. Their will be wheelchair access as much as possible across the development. Also we will be looking into providing a fishing pond with wheelchair access as we want to set new standards in this matter right across the development.</p> <p>Economic The site may provide future employment in all the different aspects we are including in these proposals. We are in consultation at the moment concerning rural and green projects to become part of the whole concept. The site may also increase the investment into the area as mention in the introduction.</p>	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Other Important Issues The residents of Denham are very concerned that the village will lose its identity even more should any development happen in the village, on the Denham side of the Hargrave road. We can get letters or a petition from the villagers to back this up.</p> <p>The residents of Barrow who live on the Bury road are against the fact that if a development happens directly across the road from them they will have loose there clear view with no obstructions, they also will put they signatures on any letters or petitions€™ to state that.</p> <p>With our development they will look across at a line of trees that will include such wonders as Oak, Plane, Copper Beech and disease resistant Elm, plus flowering shrubs of all kinds.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Location</p> <p>The site could not be positioned any better than it is, it will not expand the size of the village along any of the roads. From the air it will only lend itself to rounding the village of, and that is a quote from a planner within your office.</p> <p>All the building during development will take place behind the village reducing unsightly views and disturbance to the area, which is of major concern to the locals. Works access will be kept away from the village centre, with access from the Hargrave road only. With the possibility of access in the future from the Bury road, as indicated on the site plan. That consultation cannot be finalised until we have a positive answer to our proposal.</p>	See above	See above
	Mr A Larwood					<p>No Disturbance to Denham at all.</p> <p>Sewage.</p> <p>We have been in touch with Anglia Water many times, so we can safely say that the site is perfectly placed for the sewage works, it is downhill from the site. No roads to cross, or buildings to avoid and only the sites land to disturb. Perfect. We have contact in Anglian Water at executive level.</p> <p>Press.</p> <p>With this model comes an ideal opportunity for some very good press to be had. The regional press will love to run updates on how it is going with the complete involvement of the locals and them benefiting so much from the Development. Because of the Daily Telegraphs recent interest in parish council matters in Suffolk, as they, as well as other publications and media have been in touch for a while now, we are also aware that they are very interested in doing follow up pieces and watching the project from the start.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Should planning permission be granted this development is big enough to cater for all the required housing in Barrow until 2031. In accordance with your own published literature, stating the required housing in key locations, Barrow being one.</p> <p>We are only going forward with this proposal after extensive advice and research, after years of discussion with the highest bodies in both government and all other necessary departments. With much praise from all who have been kept updated, both here and abroad.</p> <p>Again, may I say that this has been planned, with the hope that we will be able to work as a team with all in St Edmundsbury borough council. We are all excited about this project and looking forward to our design and planning sessions, with the residents and their total involvement.</p> <p>(See attached plan and statement)</p>	See above	See above
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	See questions 1-22	The responses made to other questions have been noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15926	Terry Austin				yes	20.1 Greene King continue to support two pubs Major flooding of roads within and surrounding village Traffic increase will worsen this. Major issue for pedestrians/cyclists within village. Also horse riders Increase recreational areas free at point of use	The comments regarding flooding and traffic impact are noted.	No changes required
RVR15998	Dr MA and Mrs EC Scott				no	<p>We are writing to register and place on record our strong objections to the proposed housing development on land to the East and to the West of Barrow Hill, Barrow. We have received the relevant notification from your office and attended one of the consultation events to gain more details around this project.</p> <p>Whilst we understand and appreciate the need for the Council to investigate the need to develop more housing within the Borough for the future, there are several reasons why this particular proposal is flawed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposed site is currently used agricultural land which would be lost for good. 2) The boundaries indicate that this development will be infilling around the back of, and to the side of, a large number of current dwellings. 3) This development would lead to an unacceptable over density of houses at this end of Barrow village. 	Noted. The sites proposed are identified in an opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. Prior to the submission of planning applications Development Briefs must be prepared to detail issues such as landscaping and access.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dr MA and Mrs EC Scott					<p>4) This will have a direct and negative visual impact on the existing houses leading to loss of existing views from neighbouring properties and resulting in an adverse effect on the character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>5) There will inevitably be an increase in noise and disturbance on the existing home owners.</p> <p>6) A significant number of existing homes will be overlooked and will experience a loss of privacy.</p> <p>7) The plans suggest that a number of trees and hedges would inevitably be lost</p> <p>8) The highway infrastructure is wholly inadequate. It is highly likely that the majority of residents moving to this development would be car owners and would need to travel through the village centre to access the A14. There is already a significant traffic load passing through the village towards the A14. This road is used as a 'cut through' for cars and numerous HGVs travelling between the A14 and the A143 and already causes problems near to the village stores.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dr MA and Mrs EC Scott					<p>9)The water table in the village is extremely high and unless extensive surface water drains are installed, there will be a significantly increased risk of flooding. We experienced (and still do) a large increase in surface water on our property following rainfall since the Doctor surgery was built two doors away.</p> <p>To reiterate, we do appreciate the need to build some new housing in the areas surrounding Bury St Edmunds but feel that Barrow village is at or very close to its functional capacity and that this is not the area within which to pursue this. If more homes were needed in this direct vicinity it would make more sense to look at options nearer to the A14 since this would be the natural traffic conduit to new residents. We object in the strongest terms to the use of land that is currently used for agricultural purposes being turned into housing estates. We believe that there are much better alternative sites available if the need to build seemingly more houses is essential to the future of this area.</p>	See above	See above
	Dr MA and Mrs EC Scott					We would be grateful if you could register our considered and valid objections to this housing proposal. We would also be grateful for any comments that you and your colleagues have in response to our concerns.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV6a, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Sites RV6b and RV6c 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). Barrow Primary School is not capable of accommodating additional pupils from the proposed short term development, even if the Schools Organisation Review does not require the school to take on additional year groups. The county council would seek developer contributions, as per the Developers Guide, to expand Barrow Primary, though we do foresee potential problems with school expansion, should the Barrow Business Park expansion (RV6d) come forward. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of these sites remain valid.	Noted. Archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage. The comments in relation to RV6d are noted and Policy RV3 has been amended to ensure the employment allocation allows for school expansion.	Policy RV3 has been amended to ensure the employment allocation allows for school expansion.
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) This site has the potential to support amphibians, bats and a range of bird species, we therefore recommend that appropriate ecological surveys are carried out at this site. (b) This site features a central hedge which links to Willsummer Woods, which is designated as a County Wildlife Site (CWS). Any development of this site should include a suitable buffer of this hedge to ensure that it is not adversely affected by development, the indicative housing numbers included within this document should take such a buffer in to account.	Noted. Ecological investigations are dealt with at the planning application stage. The CWS is noted and shown on the indicative site plan.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no	1. Page 57 appears to capture local residents' concerns accurately but the text does not provide sufficient firm undertakings that the issues raised will be adequately addressed: the three development sites propose to install 179 new houses, but it is recognised that there are constraints on the ability of drainage and sewerage facilities to meet the requirements of the proposed developments. It is also obvious that there would be a very significant increase in traffic on local roads. Point 20.5 (a) says the scale of growth will be dependent on local environmental and infrastructure capacity. From what I can see in this document, there is no clear commitment or plan for addressing the infrastructure requirements, but there IS a commitment to allow 179 additional houses to be built. This is wrong and is not in line with the policies and aspirations laid out earlier in the document. This MUST be addressed.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the Rural Vision accompanies this document and sets out what infrastructure will be required and when. Policy RV3 Amended to allow for expansion of Barrow Primary School.	Make reference to the IDP in supporting text of policy. Policy RV3 Amended to allow for expansion of Barrow Primary School.
	Dale Robertson					2. There is no mention of the need to expand the primary school to accommodate the increased population which will result. There obviously needs to be a firm commitment to address this requirement appropriately; failure to do so makes the proposed developments impractical. 3. It is recognised that the proposed business park may restrict the ability of the primary school to expand. Has the primary school been consulted about this and if so are they in agreement with the proposals?	See above	See above
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no	Development of new housing should be sited in areas which are not already burdened with heavy traffic. Rural areas which include agricultural land is being converted into housing land - we do not see any plans for food sustainability. We are being encouraged to 'grow our own' , yet valuable fertile land for agriculture is being converted to housing. Importing food will increase our county's carbon footprint when we rely on other countries to produce much needed food items.	Noted. The sites proposed are identified in an opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. Prior to the submission of planning applications Development Briefs must be prepared to detail issues such as landscaping and access.	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				no	We live at 11 barrow hill, our home will be swamped by this development. We will have no privacy. We will have noise and traffic movement front and rear of our property. The footpath will become a pedestrian link bikes skateboards street lights and general noise. Our precious views of the countryside behind us totally removed forever that is why we built our home here. This development east is not central even though it looks like it on Ariel maps. The access is as far away from the centre of the village as it could be. The stress this is causing to us is unbearable our lives will be devastated. It is too big we don't need the impact massive and unwelcome. I have spoken to people and people are annoyed it is unwelcome it was badly advertised the 2 posters put up were removed within days I did complain at the village hall on the public viewing day. The 2021 date misleading as previously mentioned.	Noted. The sites proposed are identified in an opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. Prior to the submission of planning applications Development Briefs must be prepared to detail issues such as landscaping and access. The Preferred Options consultation was undertaken in accordance with the council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement	No changes required
	Mr and Mrs Kybird					The concentration on the east is far higher than the concentration on the west and on a smaller sight. We are not on any bus route school or otherwise. Not near to the school people will drive so increased traffic .no parking at school big problems already with dangerous parking. Pavements unsuitable not wide enough roads to narrow lorries have trouble passing and cross verges and pavements. There is a lot of lorry movement up and down barrow hill. The access is on a dangerous bend which people access the village at speed. Children make up to five crossings to reach middle and upper bus stops. The development means all traffic will have to go through entire village as not near school, A14 or bury. This village can cope with the 40 properties proposed for the centre but no more we are a village.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr and Mrs Kybird					Congestion outside village shop causing danger to cars and pedestrians. We need to stay feeling as a village people have made their homes here because of the size we are any bigger we loose that and segregation will occur. This end of the village is mainly retired people families are in the centre closer to school the school is the centre the village will be stretched and loose its identity. We love our home and our views this is too big, too concentrated and not advertised enough the only people who don't complain is those whose doorstep it is not on. This is a much wider implication from destroying our wildlife which we watch from our home, deers, owls, bats, peace and quiet. The homes to be effected are individual we never choose to be part of an estate. We strongly oppose this vision its too much. Everything will be effected from noise schooling privacy the list goes on.	See above	See above
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 23: Barrow (RV6)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 23a - Do you agree with draft policy RV6 on Barrow?	Question 23b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15671	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>I have completed you online survey as suggested - my reference is RVR21020E. However, unlike previous times - at least three times in the last years - you do not seem to allow for a full reasoned argument/objection to the plans, just being satisfied with a tick box exercise. So be it.</p> <p>However, even though all of my previous objections to this particular proposal - RV7b - will be on your files I have little faith that you will refer to them and so am repeating them below. These were sent to you in 2005, but are similar to those sent to you prior to this, and subsequently only about 2 years ago when this last reared its head.</p> <p>Overall, this is nothing more than another attempt for the farmer to profiteer on land that is for all the community.</p>	Site RV7b has been removed due to the nature of objections received	Removed Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Note, I have updated some of the below to reflect the current proposals.</p> <p>My wife and I have very strong objections to the proposals included in the Omission Site details sent to us on June 27 2005, and shown on the maps entitled Redeposit Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan Omission Sites 062 and 063 (these accord with your new proposals RV7b).</p> <p>Contrary to the approved St Edmundsbury Plan, these cover a proposal to utilise the land behind the Swan Public House known as Backfield, and the adjoining Backside Meadows, for housing development plus car parking (We accept that your current proposal is only for Backfield). In passing we also believe that, if there is a need for significantly more housing in Clare, there are several other sites that are considerably better for this than the land actually designated within the Approved Plan - Land East of the Granary, and our recommendations on this are covered in Attachment B.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Our objections to the Omissions can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>The whole of this area of southwest Clare is notorious for flooding, and the closure of Ashen Road and the inundation of houses in the area have been common over many years. In fact this has been much more frequent since the development of the original Granary site. This is due to the relatively steep slope of the River Stour on the north side (as opposed to relatively gentle slopes on the south side), and sites like the 13th C Priory have regularly been at threat. In contrast, there has never been flooding on the south side of the river and, although most of this lies in Essex rather than St Edmundsbury, this would seem to be an area much better suited for consideration, with a little overdue cooperation between councils.</p>	See above	See above
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>All of this exists already with the current situation. If one then adds the concreting over of the Backside Field/Backside Meadows/Granary East this will accelerate this even more and it is inevitable that the situation will worsen considerably despite any drainage attempts.</p> <p>Added to this, however, is a much larger problem. The properties and walls that back onto this proposed site are more than a metre lower than the field level and so the risk of flooding to these properties, either by inundation or by undermining the foundations is significantly higher. At present this wall is in imminent danger of falling due to these circumstances. This applies particularly to our own property, High Barn, where the level of the field is half way up our first floor.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Geology and Topography</p> <p>As I'm sure you know, if you refer to the local geology this area is of underlying chalk overlaid by glacial deposits of various kinds, mostly clays rather than alluvial. However, if one looks at the cross section of the geology one can see that the actual Stour Valley, below the glacial deposits, is extremely deep - some 200 feet or more in this area. This pre-glacial valley has then filled up with the more clayey type deposits rather than what one might expect - deposits of an alluvial type. Alluvial deposits are porous, but the glacial deposits are much more water repellent/retentive and this just exacerbates the whole potential flooding situation by creating a sodden condition which then increases the speed of runoff.</p> <p>Also, if one looks at older maps of Clare, there is a small river that for a part of its journey follows the footpath behind all of our houses, and is now underground. This of course creates even more water flowing from the site.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Wildlife & the Environment</p> <p>We fully appreciate, unfortunately, that in this day and age wildlife takes a significantly second place to house planning for most local authorities. Of course I don't know your position on this, but as a town lucky enough to have such tourist features as the Country Park, and an extremely pleasant overall rural environment we hope that you are at least a little sympathetic to the following points.</p> <p>The fields under discussion, and in particular the very long hedges surrounding them are particularly rich in wildlife and play an important role in nesting and habitat for a multitude of species. For example some three months ago, for our house and environs, we participated in the annual RSPB survey. The following were our results of observations in our garden over a 24 hour periods: Robins, Chaffinches, Bullfinches, Green Woodpecker, Magpies, Sparrows, Wren, Wood Pigeons, Doves, Blue Tits, Great Tits, Crow, Starlings.</p>	See above	None
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Over a longer period this list is of course even longer, with several owls, ducks, cuckoo etc, and many of these are nesting in the hedges and trees in these fields. We also regularly see rabbits, foxes, voles, weasels and the very occasional snake, which is quite remarkable so close to a town.</p> <p>The people of Clare clearly appreciate this lovely environment, and the footpaths all around the fields under discussion are very heavily used by ramblers, dog walkers, families and people just out for a 'breath of fresh air'. This would all be lost with a large housing estate on the site.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Previous Council Plans</p> <p>I admit to not being an expert on this, but I do know that other objectors have more detail. It is my understanding that this whole area of the Backfields was, at some time in the past, actually designated by St Edmundsbury Council as an 'Important Open Space', and 'Conservation Land' within the 'Conservation Area Boundary'. I have seen the maps to this effect. Now I'm not sure how far down the planning process this got, but it is certainly a fact that if these particular fields were to be built on, the whole rural character and layout of Clare would change and presumably this was taken into account at the time. One of the major features of the town is how far the countryside penetrates into the heart of the place, and this is much appreciated by locals and visitors alike. In our particular case, we had been seeking to live in a converted barn for several months before finding this one in Clare.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>It was the only one we have ever seen, then and now, that was actually inside a town instead of way out of town on a farmyard - somewhat unusual and very attractive.</p> <p>Traffic & Congestion</p> <p>There is no access to this site at all from any road. Within the overall proposals there seems to be a potential new road to the rear of the Nethergate St properties. This really does seem to be an enormous waste of taxpayers' money for absolutely no benefits. It would also turn part of Nethergate St into a large traffic island, and further increase runoff/flooding issues, let alone add to congestion. Again this would totally change the character of the whole town when one of the key future roles of the town must be to improve its tourism and preserve its character.</p>	See above	See above
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>Aesthetics</p> <p>In summary, the Proposal is to develop a very large, high density, dominating housing estate (actually one also should add the two existing ones - Westfield and The Granary - as well to give quite a major conurbation), built on a prominent hill visible from a long distance, negative to the character of the area, that increases risk of floods, increases congestion and traffic, destroys an important part of the countryside in the core of Clare, and increases noise and light pollution across the whole town,</p> <p>All this so that a local farmer can, through this proposal, gain re-designation of land usage, and sell this for an enormous gain. We ask that you reject this proposal outright.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>ATTACHMENT B (not relevant particularly for this objection, but left in for completeness).</p> <p>It is somehow Luddite to just criticise and not come up with alternative proposals. Clearly St Edmundsbury Council want to do some developments, much as we don't personally agree with them. We therefore recommend the following for consideration:</p> <p>Reject the Omission proposals 062 and 063 Re-consider approved proposal for the land east of the Granary Investigate sites much more appropriate to development: East of Middle School (off Cavendish Road) - closer to centre, much closer to schools, no flooding risk, flatter and less visible, less wildlife disruption Several ideal sites south of the River Stour - gentle slope, no neighbouring properties, less visible. Talk to Essex CC.</p>	See above	See above
	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus				<p>For the maintenance of the character and rural aspect of Clare: Consider a number of smaller developments of, say 20-25 houses Put these over several, smaller, sites Go for quality housing, mixed in type but especially for the two major demands - young people and elderly people, including more sheltered housing</p>	See above	

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15672	Malcolm and June Smith				yes	In response to your recent mailing concerning proposed development site RV7b (land at rear of Nethergate St.), we would offer the following:- We are in favour of the development of this site because:- It abuts the present established development of the town. It is very convenient for access to the town centre. The number of houses anticipated is not excessive for the infrastructure. A portion allocated to business use would seem appropriate to facilitate the survival of the town as a Key Economic Centre. We believe the town needs more sensibly priced middle of the road housing to appeal to a younger clientele to ensure the continuance of the town as a vibrant economic unit. Development of this site, and others, cannot come soon enough.	Site RV7b has been deleted due to the nature of objections received	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15674	David Cripps	Hardwicke House Group Practice			yes	We would be in favour of the development in Clare as advised to us. In particular, low cost entry level housing would be particularly useful.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15691	Mrs R. M. E. Harvey				no	<p>1. Conservation area</p> <p>2. Traffic already over congested in Nethergate St</p> <p>3. Risk of flooding due to water coming off the hill into Nethergate St, also affecting The Priory</p> <p>4. Peaceful area of graveyard and outwalk would be destroyed</p> <p>5. Access to Nethergate St would be dangerous</p> <p>6. Existing footpath would be spoilt</p> <p>7. The open area above Nethergate St which is used and appreciated by many locals for walking etc., at the moment lovely open countryside, would be destroyed.</p>	Site RV7b has been removed due to the nature of objections received	Removed Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no	<p>RV7a - Agree suitable for housing</p> <p>RV7c - Agree suitable for housing</p> <p>RV7b - NOT SUITABLE. Road accesses difficult cutting through other open land. 75 properties is far too many for one site. A delightful conservation area will be ruined for ever. There will be overlooking, noise and loss of enjoyment for many existing homes and gardens. The difficulties with water dispersal and pressures with local services schools etc would be enormous. The historic environment of Clare would be spoilt completely by such a vast change.</p>	Site RV7b has been removed due to the nature of objections received	Removed Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no	RV7a - Land to east of Granary - Agree suitable for housing RV7c - Land Cavendish Road - Agree suitable for housing RV7b - Land rear of Nethergate Street. Disagree - nor suitable for 75 properties. A beautiful conservation area with listed buildings/walls, a peaceful cemetery and wildlife area adjacent (The Nuttery). It is far too big as one site, the character of the town will be changed for the worse forever. The road access is lengthy and a potential 150/200 vehicles to and from site will only exacerbate existing heavy traffic/parking problems. There will be lots of noise, overlooking and loss of enjoyment for many existing homes and gardens.	Site RV7b has been removed due to the nature of objections received	Removed Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15775	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes			yes	Support Site RV7c (6.2e) Land off Cavendish Road Clare. We respond to the public consultation version of the Rural Vision 2031 (published March 2012) with specific reference to site RV7c(6.2e) Land off Cavendish Road, Clare. We demonstrate below that the site can be brought forward for early development ahead of others in Clare. We comment specifically on the responses to the Consultation process as follows: - Various issues have been raised relating to development in Clare. Some are broad issues of principle, others are site specific, we would comment on each of these in relation to our site. Rural Vision paragraph 21.8 (page 61) a. Town centre congestion: -As an edge of town development at least the traffic coming in from or going out to the east will not need to pass through the town. b. An increase in traffic volume: -See previous comment	The comments are noted and support for site RV7c is welcomed.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>c. Infrastructure: - As development is required infrastructure will need to be upgraded as appropriate to support the proposed development. If this is essential in respect of our site we will be required to contribute towards the necessary provision (but see paragraph 'g' below relating to sewage capabilities.)</p> <p>d. Impact on Historic Properties: - Site RV7c (6.2e) is on the edge of town and as such does not directly affect historic properties.</p> <p>e. Development in keeping with historic character: -This can be controlled by the planning process (Land Charter have a consistent track record delivering well considered and complimentary development within St Edmundsbury.)</p>	See above	No changes required
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>f:- This can be considered within our flood risk assessment. Careful design engineering will ensure that the risk is minimised and our design meets regulatory requirements.</p> <p>g. Sewage capabilities: -Anglian Water have confirmed that the sewage system has capacity to deal with the proposed flows from the development. See 3.3 and 3.4 of attached AW report dated 26.03.11.</p> <p>h. Density of development: - This can be controlled by the planning process</p> <p>i. Affordable housing: -This can be controlled by planning process and in any event we will provide what is required by SEBC planning policy at the time when the development is granted planning permission.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>l. Increased noise: -Realistically noise is only likely to be a short term issue during construction. Construction hours can be limited by the planning process. In any event noise is unlikely to be an issue on this site since it is essentially a stand-alone development which is not closely related to other residential or noise sensitive receptors.</p> <p>m. Sustainability: - Additional housing will help support the existing facilities in the town</p> <p>n. Scale of development: - Our proposal is for a planting buffer to reduce the visual impact of the development. We consider that its scale is not out of keeping with areas of other development in the town.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>j. Loss of agricultural land: -Site ref RV7c (6.2e) is on land that is in domestic use - paddocks. It is of a size that is not likely to be commercially viable to bring back into agricultural use.</p> <p>k. parking: -Parking standards can be controlled by the planning process</p> <p>o. Brownfield development: -This plan does not cover brownfield sites in the town which could come forward at any time. In this case areas of greenfield development are required in order to meet housing needs.</p> <p>p. Impact least on east of town: -Agreed</p> <p>q. Footpaths: -Our proposal will enhance the highway footpath network</p>	It is important that some indication is given to the likely timescale of development. The phasing allows for the regular delivery of housing across the plan period and ensures settlements are not overloaded with new development. This site is phased for medium term to allow current planned development on the site at the Granary to take place first	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>21.16. Phasing: -We would suggest that the proposed phasing of the Clare sites needs to be reconsidered in view of the capacity of the foul drainage system. Anglian Water have indicated that there is sufficient capacity in the water treatment works and the foul sewage system for our development to be developed immediately (see attached anglian water report at 3.3 and 3.4) WE will of course prepare a full development brief as required.(The basis of this has already been submitted as part of our Rural Vision 2031 submission)</p> <p>21.17. Statutory Consultee Comments: -Anglian Water (dated 26.03.12) - see attached report and our previous comments above. There is sufficient Water Treatment Works capacity and Drainage System capacity for Site Ref RV7c (6.2e) to be developed immediately. Suffolk County Council</p>	See above	No changes required
	Henrik Darlington	Land Charter Homes				<p>Site RV7c (6.2e) is substantially within the 30mph limit (only approximately 12 metres of the site frontage is outside to the east - see attached plan) so the proposed development access can therefore be laid out within current Government and Suffolk County Council guidelines. In view of the foregoing, we request that you review the phasing and timing of the proposed Clare allocations with a view to bringing our site forward for earlier commencement of development. (See attachments)</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15779	John Collecott	The Clare Society			no	<p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this document. We have 108 Members and our Committee and a meeting of Members have considered it in your declared context of providing ...'a vision and planning framework for the rural areas up to 2031'. We believe it is generally a suitable blueprint but, rather than comment section by section, we wish to concentrate our comments on Section 21.Clare (pages 60 to 64) which is all important to the Clare Community and our Members.</p> <p>The Clare Society's position has been very clear for sometime, namely -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No significant development until an overall review of INFRASTRUCTURE has been done and adequate INFRASTRUCTURE up-grades put in place to accommodate such new development/s - No more than 20 to 30 houses on any one site - Develop BROWN field sites before GREEN field sites 	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the Rural Vision accompanies this document and sets out what infrastructure will be required and when. All of the sites identified lie within an identified opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study. The sites do not lie within an identified area of flood risk. Prior to the submission of a planning applications a Development Brief must be prepared to detail issues such as amount of land available for development, landscaping, access, design and landscaping. The housing numbers give an indicative capacity which will be finalised at the Development Brief stage</p>	

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>Section 21.3 (page 60) mentions the Clare Community Plan which was published in October 2010, and adopted by Clare Parish Council, which stated on page 35 section 5.5 - 629 (83%) respondents would like to see a small gradual year on year increase on smaller sites, rather than significant number of new housing on one or two large sites. 48.2% respondents want new houses 'on previously developed land' against 15% 'on previously undeveloped land'. Also 'There was no significant preference for development either in the centre of town or on the edge of town'.</p> <p>The Clare Society and the Clare Community Plan are both saying they want phased incremental smaller developments, not major developments, preferably on brown field sites. In sharp contrast Bury BC's Rural Vision 2031 is promoting large developments on three green field sites. It is of great concern to our Members that these sites are being driven by Developers not the Clare Community, despite claims in the document and the NPPF that the aspirations of local communities will be respected.</p>	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>In Clare in the past 10 years or so small groups of houses have been built at Lutus Close, St Peters' Court, Boat House Mews, Barehams Yard, Broomfield Court, all but one on brown field sites. In section 21.14 it is acknowledged that the two brown field sites of Townsend Nurseries and Church Farm High Street could come forward for development and we believe this is highly likely in the period to 2031.</p> <p>The Clare Society fully understands the need for new houses in Clare, particularly Affordable Housing (section 2.6 page 9) and sees no problem with providing 200 houses in the period between now and 2031 provided it is properly phased and as Councillor John Griffiths says in his Foreword 'Any growth must be as appropriate, sensitive and sensible as possible'.</p> <p>Our specific comments on the sites are -</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>DENSITY</p> <p>Clare is a small historic market town in a rural area, not a city, large town or suburban conurbation and the density on each development site should be smaller, preferably 20 to 30, rather than a developer driven number to maximise their profit from the site. There is a demand for Affordable Housing for local people and for older people wishing to downsize but Bury BC have not demonstrated the need for significant numbers of market based houses for local people. The Clare Society are keen to support our business community and shops and encourage young people to come to live in Clare, go to our schools and buy locally. However, the reality of life is that, particularly with young people, they will do their major shopping at the supermarkets outside Clare and be employed outside Clare which both mean travel will be by car.</p>	See above	

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>PHASING (section 9.31 and 21.5a)</p> <p>The Clare Community Plan and The Clare Society consider tolerable phasing as year on year not large dollops of 60, 75 and 64 houses.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE (sections 1.4, 3.9 and 21.5)</p> <p>Whether sewerage, water supply, traffic volumes etc they must be reviewed before not after any major planning applications are granted. We are concerned that the Utilities are in denial and just tick boxes because they are short of money and therefore cannot admit that some aspects of ancient infrastructure in Clare badly needs an up-grade. We very much hope that Bury BC will arrange a summit for the relevant Utilities to meet with Clare Parish Council, The Clare Society and other interested parties so that infrastructure problems can be aired and resolved.</p>	See above	

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>FLOODING (sections 21.5 and 21.8f)</p> <p>Flood risk, mainly caused by water run-off from new developments, is a very important issue, particularly for The Priory and other historic properties in Nethergate Street and Stoke Road and adequate provision for this must be built into any development before not after planning permission is granted and be verified independently.</p> <p>RV7a) LAND EAST OF THE GRANARY Meantime, comments in advance are -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thank you for delivering to us earlier this week the mass of documentation covering Application No: SE/12/0461/FULCA . Meantime, before studying these documents and responding, our general comments are - - This site is green field and in Clare Conservation Area - Our Members consider 20 to 30, but not 60, houses on this site would be tolerable if no brown field sites are available 	The site at Cavendish Road is not in an identified area of flood risk	No changes required
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good site for some Affordable Housing - A good weatherproof foot path, with suitable landscaping, needs to be built from the site along the top of Cliftons Orchard Field and along the bottom of RV7b to the High Street for pedestrians - The sewerage Pumping Station adjacent on Stoke Road needs to be substantially up-graded to accommodate the extra houses as a condition of any development - Satisfactory management of run-off water must be built into the plans and be independently verified 	Planning permission was granted for RV7a in December	The document will be updated to reflect the current status of the site.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>RV7b) LAND REAR OF NETHERGATE STREET</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site is green field in Clare Conservation Area - Our Members consider this the most contentious and most difficult of the three sites because it backs onto many houses, is near the centre of Clare and will substantially change the character of Clare and use up a large open space, much used on its perimeter by walkers with or without dogs - A number of our Members feel strongly that there should be no development on this site - Its attraction is its position adjacent to the High Street and within easy walking distance of the shops and Primary School - If, however, this site goes forward for development we consider - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 75 houses are far too many on this site, which needs a good mix of houses and open spaces B) It is inappropriate to consider business use or a public car park C) Housing must be of bespoke excellent design to complement the many historic house close to the site 	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D) Very careful planning is required - done sensitively this could be an award winning site E) Tree planting would be necessary on the access road to shield the Nethergate Street houses and provide an attractive entrance F) Satisfactory management of run-off water must be built into the plans and independently verified to prevent flood risk to Nethergate Street properties 	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>RV7c) LAND OFF CAVENDISH ROAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A green field site not in Clare Conservation Area - Our Members consider this to be the most suitable site for priority development - 20 to 30 houses sensible but 64 too many - Good site for Affordable Housing - Good position adjacent to the new Stour Valley Community School - No flooding issues that end of Clare - Clare's main sewerage station is in the Stour Valley across Cavendish Road - Site equidistant from the centre of Clare as RV7a), but might feel further away - A good weatherproof footpath is necessary at the back of the site and behind the School, running down to the Recreation Ground and, ideally, linking into the reopening of the footpath onto Bridewell Street which gives access to the Primary School 	Members views that this is the most suitable site for development are noted	No changes required
	John Collecott	The Clare Society				<p>We see this latest LDF Rural Vision 2031 exercise, and the finalisation of the Government's NPPF, as a great opportunity for Bury BC and the Clare Community to cooperate closely to create the best joined up plan for Clare in the next two decades.</p> <p>Clare Society Committee Members are keen to meet with Councillor Alaric Pugh and relevant Councillor and Officer Colleagues to discuss the above. Please continue to keep us posted on all LDF developments.</p>	The Council will continue working with the Clare Community	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15786	Geoffrey Bray				yes	<p>RV7 (b). Although we live in Nethergate Street, and this site backs onto our own property, we are not in principle against a residential development on this site in due course. However to ensure it in no way detracts from the beauty of Clare as it is at present we would strongly resist any planning application that</p> <p>did not plant a row of native deciduous trees along the side of the footpath next to the existing flint wall, thereby shielding current properties to some extent, and providing an attractive avenue for pedestrians and cyclists going into the town from the proposed development east of the Granary (RV7 (a)). We would recommend these trees should be planted in the very near future so that when the development takes place they have already started to grow. We would be willing to contribute towards the costs of some of these trees.</p>	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Geoffrey Bray					<p>the houses built should be an attractive design that fits in well with the current architecture of Clare. This does not mean it should be a pseudo medieval design. A suitable, bespoke, modern design could add to the attractiveness of Clare but some 'off-the-peg' estate development would be wholly unsuitable. We would suggest the appointment of a local architect, who was familiar with the town and committed to enhancing Clare, who would work with both the developer and representatives of Clare to produce a development that was generally acceptable to everyone, should be a condition of any planning permission.</p> <p>involved any public car park or commercial development. The former would add additional pollution and noise to the site, which is in a conservation area, and the latter would be totally unsuitable for this site.</p>	See above	See above
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no	<p>Objections are raised to the proposed allocation RV7b, and to a lesser extent RV7a, in Clare.</p> <p>This proposed allocation is considered to be contrary to the adopted St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 Policy CS3 'Design and Local Distinctiveness', Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' and the recommendations in the adopted St Edmundsbury Clare 'Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan' September 2008.</p> <p>It is contended that the development of RV7b would result in significant, and irreversible, harm to the setting of the considerable Heritage Assets in the form of the Listed Buildings along Nethergate Street which back onto the site and it would fail to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area within which it is located (Document 1).</p>	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>National Planning Policy in PPS5 Policy HE7.4 states that Local Planning Authorities should take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of Heritage Assets. HE9.1 is clear that the significance of Heritage Assets can be harmed by development within its setting – stating that there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of Heritage Assets.</p> <p>In the Clare Conservation Appraisal and Management Plan, in the Special Analysis section, it is noted that 'From any point in the historic centre of Clare the open countryside is no more than a short stroll and the rear of many properties give way to open fields mature trees and shrubs are in abundance throughout Clare and make a positive addition to the streetscape and the overall character of the Conservation Area'.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>With particular regard to Nethergate Street, it is stated that 'Buildings tend to increase in size to the West, where there is a good collection of noteworthy grand houses, with smaller properties close to the Centre. There is a high concentration of Grade 1 and Grade 2* Listed Buildings in the West end of the street'. It would be noted that the proposed development is to the rear of this high concentration of Grade 1 and Grade 2* Listed Buildings (Document 2).</p> <p>Whereas at the present time these Heritage Assets have long gardens backing onto open countryside which also forms part of the designated Conservation Area, if the proposal was to be implemented there would be a 9 metre wide road, incorporating a 5.5m carriageway and 2 x 1.8m footways together with street lighting, beyond which there would be, in part, the proposed residential development. This has to be detrimental to the significant Heritage Assets in this location of Clare.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>PPS5 HE7.1 stresses that Local Planning Authorities should identify, and assess, the particular significance of any part of the historic environment which may be affected by the relevant proposal and this does not seem to have been undertaken in this case.</p> <p>The allocation has been pursued despite objections raised by English Heritage who state that 'The site is within the Conservation Area and could potentially affect the setting of a large number of Listed Buildings. Recommend that this site should be omitted from the Site Allocations DPD'.</p> <p>In addition, Suffolk County Council raised objections on highway grounds and suggested that it may be necessary to create a right turning lane within Nethergate Street to serve the quantum of development and stating that, in the interest of road safety, it is not considered desirable to have commercial/employment traffic using residential roads.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>Elsewhere in the Rural Vision Statement, notably in Paragraph 21.8, the comments received highlighting the undesirability of new development impacting on the surrounding historic properties and stating that development should be in keeping with the historic character are noted. Neither of these two suggestions is reflected in this proposed allocation.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to all the requirements noted in the adopted Core Strategy Policy CS3. No account appears to be taken of the protection of the landscape and historic views, the protection of the natural and historic environment nor access and transport considerations.</p> <p>It is the access implications which will have a profound impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, the Heritage Assets and the approach to Clare along this historic street.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>The existing unmade track, which is lined by mature trees and hedgerows and which forms part of a marked circular walk around Clare, will be totally changed in character to facilitate the provision of a 9 metre high adopted highway, incorporating footpaths and street lighting and possibly with having a right turn facility in Nethergate Street (Document 3 Photographs 1-5).</p> <p>There will be a loss of the walls along Nethergate Street to facilitate the required visibility splays and a considerable number of the mature trees will be removed and replaced by street lighting. This will have a detrimental impact on the heritage assets.</p>	See above	See above
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>Moreover, the length of road to access the development site is unnecessarily long given the availability of other sites within Clare. Not only will it impact on the curtilage of Listed Buildings but it will extend along the outside of the built edge of Clare dividing the Historic Core from the surrounding countryside and also visually separating the continuity of the designated Conservation Area around Clare (Document 3 Photographs 6 -8).</p> <p>It is noted that the Suffolk County Council object to employment uses and it being included within the development. Whilst this is not considered to be as material as other objections to that proposed, it is considered that 0.5 ha of employment provision alone is too small in relation to the increase in number of dwellings and to ensure that Clare remains a sustainable settlement.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>It is considered that a larger employment allocation should have been allocated elsewhere in Clare especially given that the other noted site at Bridewell Industrial site is already in existence and therefore is not considered to be a proposed new asset for the village.</p> <p>Objections are also raised to the proposed public car park within allocation RV7d. This appears to dimension approximately 22 metres x 22 metres which will facilitate the provision of 18 parking spaces only. Given the fact that the car park and its occupancy will not be visible from Nethergate Street, which will in turn necessitate intrusive signage, it is anticipated that there will be a significant number of wasted journeys along the torturous access road to get to the car parking area to find that it is at capacity and cars will then have to immediately exit.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>It is recognised that additional parking is needed within Clare but to locate it to the rear of a considerable number of Listed Buildings and accessed through a residential area along a torturous and lengthy access road is not considered to be in the interests of proper planning of the area.</p> <p>Lesser objections are raised to the proposed allocation RV7a in that it is considered that the development of this site will impact detrimentally on the Listed Buildings opposite.</p> <p>However the greater impact would result if this site and RV7b were accessed off the same roadway as this would create a further visual intrusion of an adopted and publicly lit highway separating both the built form of Clare from the open countryside surrounding.</p> <p>Further details of objections raised to the allocation, together with accompanying photographs, are attached. This statement was submitted in a previous consultation period.</p>	<p>The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received. There are other more suitable sites which can meet the housing requirements of the town in this plan period.</p>	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>Finally, it should be noted that Site RV7d does not represent the only land available for further development in Clare at the present time. It has been previously made known to the Local Planning Authority in representations submitted that land is readily available for development to the North of Clare.</p> <p>It is requested that reference be made to the representations previously submitted to the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document in June 2010 which promoted the development of land to the North of Clare off Chiltern Street on behalf of Mr and Mrs Barber (Document 4).</p> <p>It is considered that this land would ideally accommodate further growth of both residential development and employment land within Clare without any detriment to any asset of heritage significance whilst at the same time facilitating the visual enhancement of the north western approach, the enlargement and enhancement of the access to the existing employment area.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>An assurance has also been given that land in the same ownership in the vicinity of the promoted site could be made available as required for the provision of much needed public open space facilities within Clare.</p> <p>The site promoted was of a size to 'round off' the development to the north west of Clare which would be reinforced by structural landscaping around the curtilage (Document 5). The extent of development within this area could be determined by need and a far smaller development area could be allocated and brought forward in the first instance.</p> <p>It is important to note that the promoted land incorporates an existing employment area that this could be expanded, and a more suitable vehicular access provided, to ensure that employment opportunities increase at a rate commensurate with the proposed housing growth so as to ensure that development in Clare is sustainable.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>It is considered that with the provision of structural landscaping along the Western edge of the site, which could be undertaken regardless of the quantum of development allocated, then views will be softened into the village.</p> <p>Previous representations submitted were accompanied by a Transport Assessment prepared by SLR and a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Richard Jackson Plc. All the relevant documents should be in the possession of the Council and available to view on-line but additional copies could be submitted should this be required.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is considered that the land off Chiltern Street in Clare could provide both residential and employment land without any detrimental impact on the Heritage Assets of Clare and that, with associated structural landscaping, it would in time enhance the approach to Clare.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber			<p>It should also be noted that the land owners would be willing to make available such land as necessary either within, or outside, the proposed allocation for the provision of further leisure facilities to serve the population of Clare.</p> <p>This land, which has no impact on any heritage assets within Clare, is suggested as a preferable alternative to the proposed allocation RV7b.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15828	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council			no	<p>Clare Parish Council supports the broad thrust of Vision 2031, although it has concerns about the delivery of a number of aspects of the very wide-ranging agenda proposed, given both sustained pressure on public spending and the further pressure that many initiatives will inevitably place on voluntary action in local communities.</p> <p>We are very happy to acknowledge Clare as a Key Service Centre. There is a strong desire across the Town to enhance further what can be offered to the community and the surrounding villages that we serve. This is reflected in the Clare Community Plan and the more recent Parish Council 4-year (2012-16) Development Plan (summary attached) that has received widespread endorsement. We wish to ensure that Clare continues to be a vibrant and attractive place to live or visit, in economic and cultural terms, but that the character, heritage and environmental aspects of the Town are preserved. In other words, a continuing balance must be struck between development and conservation.</p>	Comments noted and support for Clare as a Key Service Centre is welcomed.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>Our detailed responses to the Questions posed in the Consultation are given in the appendix. The remainder of this letter addresses matters related specifically to proposed future development in Clare, the Parish Council's views on which have been articulated on a number of occasions. For clarity, these are re-stated here in the context of the Consultation Document.</p> <p>A major concern for us is the lack of infrastructure investment in Clare over the years. We do not believe that Clare has benefitted proportionately from the infrastructure investment undertaken by the Borough in recent years, and many of the problems highlighted below stem from this lack of investment.</p>	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the Rural Vision accompanies this document and sets out what infrastructure will be required and when. The sites identified lie within an identified opportunity area within the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Study.	No changes required
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>Housing Development and Density</p> <p>The Consultation indicates the building of 199 new homes in Clare in three major green-field developments with high density levels. There is also the potential for development on brown-field sites previously identified within the Town. The three proposed developments alone represent an increase of nearly 25% in our housing stock, and have the potential dramatically to alter the character of the Town and further over-load already stretched infrastructure services.</p>	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>We repeat our view that development should be limited to some 100 houses in total a very significant proportion should be affordable/social housing, ideally for those with familial connections to Clare all development should be sympathetic to the character of the Town in terms of style and density growth should where possible be on brown-field sites, close to the centre and with good access open spaces should be provided or maintained regard should be paid to limiting flood risk and ensuring satisfactory dispersal of surface water and sewage an integrated approach should be taken to development so that roads and other infrastructure are planned with likely future developments in mind.</p> <p>One example of this would be road access through land East of the Granary to land behind Nethergate Street.</p> <p>Our comments on the individual sites are given below.</p>		
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>Utilities Infrastructure</p> <p>We remain concerned about the adequacy of the existing utilities (gas, electricity, water, telecommunications) infrastructure given the number of problems that occur within the Town. Increased housing will inevitably add to these problems. Our view remains that an early audit of utilities infrastructure in Clare should be undertaken and the results made available to us any issues identified should be dealt with before any significant development takes place</p>	Further detail on infrastructure are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>Transport Infrastructure</p> <p>The lack of adequate parking facilities near the centre of the Town has long been a major issue which remains unresolved despite our many representations. Problems also exist in terms of the inadequacy of public transport links, whilst further significant issues have also arisen with HGV traffic causing major disruption, and speeding vehicles threatening pedestrian (particularly child) safety. Planned developments in Clare, Haverhill and elsewhere in the Borough will only add to these problems. All of these matters impact on our ability to function effectively as a Key Service Centre.</p>	The Parish Council's desire for a car park is acknowledged in the document.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				Our view is that the provision of a central car park in Clare should be a high priority for the Borough real efforts should be made to ensure the adequacy of public transport links to Key Service Centres every opportunity, particularly in relation to planned development, should be taken with the Highways Authority to introduce traffic-calming measures efforts, eg weight restrictions/planning agreements should be made to restrict unnecessary HGV traffic from the A1092	See above	No changes required
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				Community Infrastructure Clare has a thriving community with many organisations and activities on offer. It has satisfactory community facilities in terms of health care, although lacks a dental practice. The current uncertainties over the future of the Library and Clare Castle Country Park are unhelpful and the Parish Council continues to work to achieve sustainable community solutions. Our view is that any housing development must ensure commensurate and demonstrable investment in community facilities and health and social services RV7a Land East of The Granary	Planning permission was granted for RV7a in December and additional text has been inserted to reflect the latest situation.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				A Planning Application has just been received in respect of this site and our detailed comments on that application will follow in due course. Our initial observations are that it is a green-field site, within the Conservation Area, with high density housing proposed and therefore does not fit with our general view expressed above. Particular concerns relate to access arrangements to and from Stoke Road and the likely additional pressure placed on utilities infrastructure, particularly surface and foul water drainage.	See above	No changes required
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				All weather pedestrian access to the High Street and the Primary School will be an essential prerequisite. RV7b Land rear of Nethergate Street This is also a proposed high-density green-field site, within the Conservation Area and close to a number of historic properties. It is a popular area for walkers, and is particularly important because it is an area of countryside very close to the centre of the Town. It therefore does not fit with our general view expressed above. It is also the designated location for a car park, albeit that development is not planned before 2021. Our urgent need is for a car park now rather than in 9+ years' time and, as stated above, we wish this to be a priority action for the Borough.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received. The need for a car park needs to be demonstrated to the Council, particularly in view of the available spaces at Clare Town Country Park which is now managed by the Town Council	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>Apart from the potential impact on the character of the Town from a site containing high-density housing, a car park and B1 commercial use premises, a significant issue will be the provision of satisfactory access to and from the site, given its distance from the road and the fact that it will have more than residential traffic requiring entry. If this site is to be developed, our view is that it should contain a smaller number of properties, with a mix of styles all sympathetic to the location, but with a reasonable proportion of social and affordable accommodation. Given its location, it should also benefit from significant open space and tree landscaping. All the points made above concerning infrastructure also, of course, apply.</p>	See above	See above
	Claire Ebeling	Clare Parish Council				<p>RV7c Land off Cavendish Road</p> <p>This is a green-field site that is not in the Conservation Area, but does have planned high-density housing. Our major concern with this site, apart from density, is that pedestrian access to the centre of the Town is poor. The pavements are of variable width in Cavendish Road, and at Bell Corner they are dangerous, with lorries frequently mounting them and knocking over the concrete bollards. This site would require extensive investment in pedestrian infrastructure, both in terms of Cavendish Road and in the provision of a new footpath to the centre of the Town via the playing fields. (See attached 4 year plan for consultation)</p>	Provisions are made within the policy for improved footpath and cycleway access to the town centre.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	RV7b Clare. The Society objects to this allocation that would be damaging to the historic environment of this important historic small town.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15902	Mrs F Kennedy				no	Site RV7b Land at rear of Nethergate Street. This is to register my deep disapproval of the site enclosed for buildings. We already have flooding in Nethergate Street after storms and concreting over this proposed site would add greatly to our woes. Clare has been greatly extended already and a further 75 dwellings would compound the parking and other problems.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no	RV7a - Agree suitable for housing RV7c - Agree - suitable for housing RV7b - Disagree not suitable Clare is a very desirable small town. This size (75) development will ruin its character and historic environment. Smaller edge of town development would be more suitable. The extra noise, overlooking, enjoyment of walks etc would all be very negative for existing residents.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no	RV7a - Suitable - agree RV7c - suitable - agree RV7b - Not suitable This would have a negative effect on properties surrounding in this lovely conservation area. 75 properties is too large for one site so close to town centre. The amount of traffic, loss of countryside, noise, light pollution etc would ruin this lovely town.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	If it is similar to Barrow, No.	Each village has a specific policy relevant to the location, infrastructure and environmental capacity.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15929	Mr and Mrs C Geave					We are members of the Clare Society and have attended meetings of the Society to consider the Preferred Options Document. We have read the response of the Society dated 26 April 2012 and confirm that our view of the proposals is in line with the response from The Clare Society.	Your comments are noted.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Each option in Clare 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). Clare Primary is increasing its capacity to a 210 place primary through SOR. The school should be able to cope with this level of expansion in the village, as long as there are no additional allocations within the plan period. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of these sites remain valid.	Noted. Archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage. The previous comments submitted in relation to highways are noted.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				<p>(a) We note that the reptile survey carried out in support of a planning application for this site (ref: SE/12/0461) recorded an exceptional population of common lizard on the site, this species is both a UK and Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan species. The survey report identified that such a population is likely to be of county importance and we therefore query whether the allocation of this site for development is appropriate given its nature conservation value. Should this site remain as an allocation appropriate mitigation may require several years to implement and it is therefore questionable whether this site can be delivered in the short term?</p> <p>(b) This margins of this site have the potential to support both reptiles and roosting bats, we therefore recommend that surveys for these groups of species are carried out at this site.</p>	Noted. Ecological investigations are dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no	<p>This site has been identified as a conservation area on a number of occasions already. Comprehensive objections to its development are on your files from at least 3 other applications since the 1990s. It seems like the EU here - we keep saying no, you agree with us, and then someone says do it again until they say yes. This proposal is wrong. The site has no access - building it would be very costly and add to congestion along Nethergate St; drainage is poor to the point where the ancient wall to the south is falling over by under drainage problems; it has a valuable range of footpaths which all local people use; the hedgerows are full of wildlife. This is yet another attempt for the farmer to cash in with no justification, and you planners should, yet again, stop this happening now.</p>	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21423E	Adam Halford	Bidwells		Charles Church Limited	no	<p>While the allocation of sites RV7 (a) is welcomed my client objects to this section of the Rural Vision 2031 document for the following reasons.</p> <p>Paragraph 21.16 highlights that the land east of The Granary is the subject of a Development Brief, which was adopted in September 2011. Following publication of the Rural Vision document a full planning application has been lodged with the Borough Council on 3rd April 2012 (SE/12/0461/FUL), in accordance with the adopted Development Brief. The application is accompanied by technical documentation that addresses those areas of concern raised by the statutory consultees in respect of the development proposed. In light of the recently submitted application the Rural Vision document needs to be updated to reflect the current status of the land east of The Granary.</p>	Planning permission was granted for RV7a in December	The document will be updated to reflect the current status of the site.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adam Halford	Bidwells		Charles Church Limited		In addition to the above my client objects strongly to the inclusion of the indicative sketches prepared by the Borough Council for site RV7 (a), which contradicts the suggested layout proposed by the adopted Development Brief and the recently submitted application. The publication of such sketched within a policy document without any justification or appreciation of the issues associated with the site is unhelpful and at worst misleading to both residents and developers. It is not for the Rural Vision to prejudge how development should come forward. In light of the above the sketch proposal for site RV7 (a) should be deleted from the document.	See above	See above
RVR21430E	Adam Halford	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited	C/O Agent	no	While the allocation of sites RV7 (b) is welcomed, my client objects to this section of the Rural Vision 2031 document, for the following reasons. In addition to the above my client objects strongly to the inclusion of the indicative sketches prepared by the Borough Council for site RV7 (b), which is unhelpful at best and at worst misleading to both residents and developers. It is not for the Rural Vision to prejudge how development should come forward. In light of the above the sketch proposal for site RV7 (a) should be deleted from the document. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the site including an indicative masterplan illustrating how the developer considered that the site might best come forward has been prepared and will be forwarded to the council under a separate cover. (See attachment)	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adam Halford	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited			Policy RV7 requires the preparation of a Development Brief for site RV7 (b) prior to the submission of a planning application. Following experience of the Development Brief process on site RV7 (a) it is considered unnecessary serving only to prolong rather than facilitate the planning application process and delivery of housing. The existing allocation has taken six years from adoption to planning application and while part of that time reflects the volatility of the housing market at least two years of this delay can be attributed to the Development Brief process. The requirement for RV7 (b) to prepare a Development Brief should therefore be dropped from Policy RV7 in the interests of deliverability.	See above	See above
	Adam Halford	Bidwells	Charles Church Limited			The reference to delivery as medium term is unhelpful and should be removed. It is or the market and the developers to deliver development and the setting or arbitrary phasing is restrictive and prevents the delivery of sustainable site; as such the column titled "When development could take place (short/medium/long term)" should be deleted from the Policy Table. The settlement boundary does not include an area to accommodate the access road to the north of the Nethergate Street Properties between the existing and proposed allocation. The settlement boundary must be adjusted to include such a vital piece of infrastructure for the development.	See above	see above
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no	RV7a - Agree - suitable for housing RV7c - Agree - suitable for housing RV7b - Disagree - not suitable for development It would be disastrous for this delightful town to have such a large area concreted over, it is too close to the centre of this historic town and a lovely conservation area. A lengthy difficult roadway is required cutting through additional open land, highway safety would also be a concern with so much additional traffic entering/leaving the site. A site of this size would put extra pressure on already stretched local services. It would have a big negative impact for residents adjacent to the site with light and noise pollution and ruin the peaceful harmony of the cemetery and nuttury wildlife area.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no	RV7a - Agree - suitable for development RV7c - Agree - suitable for development RV7b - Disagree - not suitable for development It is far to big as one site, the character of the town would be changed for the worse, for ever. There will be lots of noise, overlooking, light pollution and loss of enjoyment for many existing homes and gardens. It is a beautiful conservation area, with listed buildings/walls, a peaceful cemetery and wildlife area (The Nuttery.) This all would be ruined for future generations. Highway safety would be a big concern also, with volume of traffic associated with a site of this size.	The level of development is being reduced through the removal of site RV7b due to the nature of the objections received.	Remove Site RV7b from the policy and accompanying Policies Map book
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	A lack of allocations in the long term may lead to a lack of sustainability and pressure for inappropriate sites to come forward.	The infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement has been assessed and sites allocated accordingly. Any applications for development will be assessed in accordance with current planning policies which will prevent inappropriate development from occurring.	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 24: Clare (RV7)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 24a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?	Question 24b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service				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 southern half of RV8b has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area)	Noted. Archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council				Concerned with impact of Ixworth development on Stanton WWTW, will this increase risk of further spillages into local waterways?	There is sufficient headroom at the Stanton WWTW for the future planned growth at Ixworth.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15845	Mandy Adlington	Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council				<p>The Parish Council would like to re-iterate the absolute requirement for additional public open spaces during the development of RV8b and 8c. Given the increased space allocated to these areas and the addition of a further 80 homes, it is imperative that the amount of recreational ground is increased in proportion. Previous comments in this area stand.</p> <p>Comments have been received in support of a hut on the desired play area within the Crown Lane development. This would provide additional public accommodation within the village and would supplement the Village Hall as a service to sports teams and youth groups.</p> <p>As a Parish Council, in association with Suffolk County Council, we have initiated and renovated a number of walks around the village. All walks have the option of crossing the A143 on Crown Lane. For safety's sake and bearing in mind the increased number of properties in that direct area, it would be prudent to include a pedestrian bridge across the Ixworth Bypass at this location. We believe that this should now be included in the Rural Vision</p>	The amount and location of open space on these sites will be determined through a concept statement and masterplan for the site. The requirement for contributions towards a safe crossing across the A143 has been included in the policy	Policy amended to include requirement for contributions towards a safe crossing across the A143

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mandy Adlington	Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council				<p>The Parish Council still have grave concerns over access to and from the new development along Crown Lane. The major concern revolves around access to and from the Village centre. We understand the Borough Council's reasoning for not opening up the new development into the village, but have real issues that the sense of community connection, as demonstrated by the majority of the village, will not be present among the new development.</p> <p>As a compromise, the Parish Council, in consultation with villagers, would like to propose that Crown Lane be connected to the A143 Stanton roundabout for exit from the village only. This would allow residents of the new development to access their homes from the village, opening up all the local services to them without having to use a remote access to the estate.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to re-iterate the need to improve the current Public Transport situation with an increased timetable to include evening services to all major towns in the area.</p>	The issue of access was determined through the development of the Crown Lane masterplan	No changes required
						<p>Additional comments It has become apparent that since 1893 when the cemetery was laid, vehicles have become larger and more difficult to manoeuvre. The Parish Council wish to have included in the Rural Vision 2031, an access gate, with roadway from Crown Lane, to gain entry to the cemetery from the NE corner of the New Piece. The cost for this could be available from Sect 106 funding.</p>	The issue of a Cemetery Gate is too specific an issue for inclusion in Rural Vision 2031.	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	RV8 Ixworth RV8a The Society objects to the impact of this allocation on the gateway to this important conservation area.	Planning permission was granted in November 2012 and the document has been updated to reflect the latest situation.	Reference to planning approval made in Policy.
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	If it is similar to Barrow, No.	Each village has a specific policy relevant to the location, infrastructure and environmental capacity.	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council welcomes the reference to improved footpath and cycleway access in RV8. We are aware of proposals for a new footbridge over the A143 to connect the village with rights of way to the east, a proposal which we believe is worth exploring. In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV8a, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Sites RV8b and RV8c 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 southern half of RV8b has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area) SOR proposals in Thurston area now approved - primary school to increase from 150 to 210 places.	The requirement for contributions towards a safe crossing across the A143 has been included in the policy. Site RV8a has been granted planning permission reference to this is made in the document. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	Policy amended to include requirement for contributions towards a safe crossing across the A143

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				But we have not had time to update forecast calculations. 90 dwellings (2011-21) would generate 22 primary pupils, 80 dwellings (after 2021) would generate 20. Ixworth CEVC Primary is already on a small site (but it uses the adjacent community playingfield) so there will be issues around increasing the building area. The future use of Ixworth Middle School site has yet to be determined. One option for use is to establish an 11-16 secondary school (there is some interest to establish a Free School here). SCC has been in discussion with the developer and their planning consultants with regard to the potential requirement to acquire some extra land to the east of the middle school site (part of Sites 6.3c & d). There is some uncertainty over the future of education sites in Ixworth at this moment in time. Further consideration needs to be given in the next few months to resolving this and we will continue to discuss the implications for the Vision documents as you work up your next draft. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of these sites remain valid.	The flexibility within the policy to allow for future uses of the school site has been maintained.	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) This site has the potential to support roosting bats, we therefore recommend that detailed bat surveys are carried out at this site. It is also known that the site supports nesting swifts, any development here should make suitable alternative provision to replace any nest sites which may be lost.	Site RV8a has been granted planning permission and reference to this is made in the document.	Reference to planning approval made in Policy.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21029E		Bidwells		S W Cross and Sons	no	<p>While the allocation of RV8 d) is welcomed and supporting technical documentation relating to Flood Risk and Transportation will be submitted under separate cover there are a number of points to which my client objects within the supporting text.</p> <p>Paragraph 22.5 g) highlights that development opportunities within the village are largely restricted to those areas east of the village and south of the A1088, which is welcomed; however reference should be made to both residential and employment development opportunities for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p>Paragraph 22.12 fails to acknowledge that supporting information demonstrating the availability, deliverability and sustainability of proposed allocation RV8 d) has been previously submitted to the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options consultation in 2010. As the background growth in traffic has been minimal during the intervening period the reports remain relevant and have been sent to the Council under a separate cover. (See attachment)</p>	Reference to 22.5 g noted, however it is considered the word 'development' encompasses both residential and employment development and so should remain.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		Bidwells		S W Cross and Sons		<p>It should be made clear that the reference to strategic open space at the end of Policy RV8 relates to residential development only and not employment uses, while the reference to strategic landscaping is applicable to both.</p> <p>The restriction of employment use to B1 ought to be relaxed to allow small-scale B8 storage and distribution with limitations on the size of vehicles and opening hours imposed by conditions at a later stage to ensure the residential amenity of nearby properties. D1 uses of the site ought also to be permitted in the interest of providing an area for employment generating community facilities, such as dentists, if required. The flexibility is sought to ensure maximum uptake of the employment allocation.</p> <p>Recognition must also be made of the contribution that employment can make as part of the balanced growth of Ixworth providing potential employment for existing residents as well as helping to prevent out-commuting patterns of new residents as residential developments are brought forward.</p>	The references to open space requirements in relation to employment allocations have been removed. The use class for this site (B1) is still considered appropriate given the location and size of the site. There are sufficient sites elsewhere in the borough for alternative employment uses.	Removed references to requirement for open space in relation to employment sites.
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no	If access to this proposed General Employment area is allowed via the new Grain Store access road, then this will mean that all traffic will be turning across traffic leaving the village. How many units are likely to be built and will this then increase further into the fields as the farmer sells off more land to make more money.	The size of the site has been identified at 0.5ha and any applications for development on the site will need to accord with other policies within the Local Plan on design, access etc	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21425E		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership	no	<p>The acknowledgement that development at Ixworth will be focussed on the land between the existing village and the A143 in paragraphs 22.5 and 22.17 is supported.</p> <p>Paragraph 22.8 is misleading as it suggested that flexibility in planning policy will be required around the Middle School to prevent any decisions prejudicing future education provision. The Suffolk Education Authority made detailed representations to the Rural Site Allocations document in April 2010 stating that the land adjacent to the Middle School is not required for education now or in the future, a fact which the borough Council has deliberately chosen not to report. Paragraph 22.8 needs to be removed in its entirety or at the very least the last sentence of that paragraph should be removed.</p>	Suffolk County Council have stated in response to this consultation that additional land may be required for school expansion and provision needs to be made for this in the policy.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		<p>Paragraph 22.10 states that for the reasons outline above the northern part of the land adjacent to the Middle School is to be reserved for education. As demonstrated the response from Suffolk County Council, which has not been reported and which demonstrates that the reasoning used to justify the sterilisation of such a site for an un-determined period of time is fundamentally flawed. Paragraph 22.10 must be deleted to make the Rural Vision sound.</p> <p>Paragraph 22.12 fails to report that the borough council have been repeatedly told from those representing the development industry and with experience of the process that the Concept Statement process is misleading to the community, time consuming and adds little to the process. Similarly the master planning process adds little to the process and equally acts to frustrate rather than facilitate delivery of residential allocations.</p>	See above. In addition a concept and masterplan are required for the site to ensure that issues such as open space and the provision of land for educational purposes are properly considered.	No changes required
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		<p>In addition the borough council have been repeatedly informed that there is no need to reserve land for education adjacent to the Middle School a point which again they have refused to acknowledge. The borough council has again chosen not to report these fundamental objections to the proposed policy and as such paragraph 22.12 is inaccurate and should be updated to include these objections.</p> <p>Paragraph 22.19 states that there may be educational requirements on the northern part of the land adjacent to the Middle School a Statement which, based on the Suffolk County Council Education response on the proposal in 2010 is as untrue now as it was then. A copy of the Suffolk County Council Response will be submitted to the Council under a separate cover. (See attachment)</p>	See above	None

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		Policy RV8 (c) indicates that the site area is to be confirmed. It is unacceptable to have an unconfirmed site area in an allocations document. The site area is 11.28 hectares on which the council are suggesting 80 dwellings on the undefined southern part and the protection of the northern part for education. The proposal does not reflect an efficient use of land and is even inconsistent with the Council's SHLAA, which suggests the site is split in two with the southern section comprising 7.28 hectares which will accommodate 105 dwellings, while the northern section comprising 4.0 hectares will provide only 30 dwellings. At the Council proposed level of development the density would only equate to 12 dwellings per hectare across the 11.28 hectares of the combined allocation, which cannot be considered an efficient use of land, which is otherwise unencumbered, sustainably located, available, deliverable and being actively promoted for development.	The site area cannot be determined until the land take required by the schools is determined. A flexible approach is required to the development of this site with numbers to be determined through a concept statement and masterplan	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		<p>Again the Borough Council have chosen to ignore the clear statement from the education authority that the land is not and will not be required for education. The allocation of RV8 (c) should be revised.</p> <p>Based on the Council's existing residential allocation within Ixworth (2.5 hectares off Crown Lane (Site RV8 a)) the Council seems to be suggesting that a density of 28 dwellings per hectare is suitable in this area. As the sites adjoin each other it would be appropriate to have a consistent development density throughout. Based on the Council's own figures of what is an appropriate density site the southern section should be allocated for at least 204 dwellings the northern section should be allocated for at least 112 dwellings, giving a combined allocation of 316 dwellings which will enable a comprehensive approach to the site and ensure that there is sufficient monies to provide the necessary infrastructure and community facilities which the village needs.</p>	The site area cannot be determined until the land take required by the schools is determined. A flexible approach is required to the development of this site with numbers to be determined through a concept statement and masterplan	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		<p>Any reference to the land being protected for educational use must be removed to make the document sound.</p> <p>The inclusion of concept statements and masterplans on the delivery of the allocation RV8 (a) has resulted in it taking six year before an application is ready for submission. While some of the time is a reflection of the economy the concept statement and masterplanning process has comfortably added three years to the delivery of the site. Any reference to concept statements or masterplans must be removed from the documents in order to expedite delivery. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment along with an indicative masterplan will be forwarded under a separate cover to illustrate how the landowner envisages the site could be comprehensively developed. (See attachments)</p>	Suffolk County Council have stated in response to this consultation that additional land may be required for school expansion.	No changes required
		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership		<p>Paragraph 22.20 is inaccurate, as it purports to document the comments received from statutory consultees but which fails to report the response of Suffolk County Council on education. Paragraph 22.20 need to be updated to include the response which stated that the land adjacent the Middle School is not needed now or in the future for education purpose, to avoid the deliberate misleading of the public in this regard.</p>	<p>This text has been deleted as the statements would be inappropriate to include in a Submission version of a Local Plan. However, a reference has been made to the County Council's uncertainty over the current future of education provision in Ixworth.</p>	<p>Include paragraph around the County Councils uncertainty of education provision in Ixworth at this time.</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21432E		Bidwells	Persimmon Homes Anglia	C/O Agent	no	<p>While the allocation of site RV8 (b) Land off Crown Lane, Ixworth is welcomed, my client objects to a number of inaccuracies in the information provided about the site. The document makes reference to the adopted Masterplan prepared for the site but fails to recognise its conclusions in the policy.</p> <p>Policy RV8 (b) states that the site has an indicative capacity of 70 dwellings which is in direct conflict to the adopted masterplan which allows for up to 90 dwellings on the site. The Rural Vision must be updated so as to be consistent with the adopted Masterplan for the site and recognise that the council approved capacity of the site is up to 90 dwellings.</p> <p>An application for up to 90 dwellings, in accordance with the adopted masterplan is being prepared and will be submitted to the borough council in the coming months. The failure of the council to recognise its own agreement to the revised capacity of the site will create uncertainty in the minds of developers and local residents alike and must remain consistently referred to as up to 90 dwellings.</p>	The document has been amended to allow for 90 dwellings on RV8b in accordance with the adopted masterplan	Policy amended to allow for 90 dwellings on Crown Lane site
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21590E	Guy Kaddish	Bidwells		Persimmon Homes Anglia Limited	no	<p>The proposed allocation of Land off Crown Lane (RV8 b) is supported. The objection is made to the indicative capacity of 70 dwellings.</p> <p>The third sentence of the policy refers that development on land off Crown Lane (b) must accord with the requirements in the adopted site concept statement and masterplan.</p> <p>The masterplan was adopted by the Borough Council as supplementary planning guidance in December 2011. The masterplan includes a capacity of up to 90 dwellings. This figure was derived through an assessed evidence base and much design work.</p> <p>The 90 dwelling figure is an approved and adopted capacity for the site which Policy RV8 should match so as to be in accordance with the approved masterplan, as required by the policy wording of RV8.</p> <p>Change required:</p> <p>Indicative Capacity for (RV8 b) Land off Crown Lane to be up to 90 dwellings</p>	Agree that the numbers should reflect the adopted masterplan	Amend housing numbers in policy to accord with masterplan
	Guy Kaddish	Bidwells		Persimmon Homes Anglia Limited		Reason:	see above	see above
						To be in accordance with the adopted Masterplan. Without the amendment to the policy the Rural Vision will not be founded on a robust evidence base.		

Rural Vision 2031
Question 25: Ixworth (RV8)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 25a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?	Question 25b -Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough					Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Ends to cope with extra density of traffic being made	The traffic implications of all of the growth has been assessed and infrastructure improvements are set out in the Rural Vision Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no	A143 highway implications	The traffic implications of all of the growth has been assessed and infrastructure improvements are set out in the Rural Vision Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15845	Mandy Adlington	Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The settlement boundary should exclude the Reeves Farm site allocation in our opinion.	Planning permission was granted for this site in November 2012 and reference to this has been made in the document.	Reference to planning approval made in the document.
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	As all previous answers	Previous comments have been considered	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
		This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21029E		Bidwells		S W Cross and Sons	no	The settlement boundary for Ixworth should be redrawn to extend across the Bardwell Road and include the proposed employment allocation and the agricultural buildings, including grain store, storage area and workshop to the south so as to establish an area for Office, Research and Development and Light Industrial employment as part of the village in an effort top help promote an employment hub for the village in this location.	The employment site is not included within the settlement boundary to restrict further inappropriate development.	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion	Please note any significant development will put more pressure on the A143 to Bury	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21425E		Bidwells		Bypass Farm Partnership	no	The exclusion of the cemetery and the middle school from the settlement boundary is unacceptable. These elements are part of the village and as such must be included within the settlement boundary.	Excluding these areas from the settlement boundary ensures protection from inappropriate uses.	No changes required
RVR21432E		Bidwells	Persimmon Homes Anglia	C/O Agent	no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 26: Ixworth Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 26a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 26b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15714	John Swan				no	<p>1. A new estate would ruin the view from our windows and would bring noise into our home and garden. This would make us obliged to consider moving.</p> <p>2. The value of our property would be considerably reduced.</p> <p>3. This estate would be completely out of keeping with the existing houses and narrow roads. Kedington would cease to be a village and become just a suburb of Haverhill.</p> <p>4. Traffic problem cause by the extra cars getting in and out of Mill Road. It's also unlikely that parents dropping children off at school would use the new car park you envisage.</p>	This site is within the housing settlement boundary and could come forward at any time. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required
	John Swan					5. Last year the Highways Authority were 'raising concerns that the access does not appear suitable for development'. What has changed their minds?	See above	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15749	Steve and Sue Brown				no	6. The boundary of our garden is part of the 'settlement boundary' of the village.	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required
	Steve and Sue Brown					<p>The vast increase in vehicle movements (and they will be huge) along Risbridge Drive will acutely affect the quality of life of people who live in that street, in particular those who have no real frontage and whose homes are extremely close to the roadway.</p> <p>Proposal RV9a appears to be making FULL use of the previously issued maximum housing quota for Kedington of 65 homes in the village before utilities etc become saturated. The other proposed development (The Limes) has miraculously grown in size from 30 to 40 capacity. Why? Recent approved small developments (e.g. Arms Lane) have already impacted on current services so infrastructure improvements will need to be undertaken before RV9a is commenced. No indication is given as to the amount of homes that can be sustained without additional services. Why not?</p> <p>The level of proposed dwellings will urbanise our village. The fact that Kedington has been designated as a Key Service Centre will clearly work against us wishing to retain a village atmosphere.</p>	<p>Site RV9b The Limes is a new site and has not previously been consulted on at a level of 30 dwellings. The capacity is indicative and will be determined by a development brief for the site.</p>	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Steve and Sue Brown					<p>The pressure seems to be mounting to expand and infill without due consideration of sustainability. Words alone do not suffice.</p> <p>This proposed level of growth in Kedington is therefore surely not sustainable in our community without increases in services etc. Bus services are threatened. The Library is not guaranteed to stay here. We now have just one pub. What we need to know is the Borough's position with regard to Housing growth and capacities but they remain curiously silent on this. We need to have some assurance that large numbers of homes which are built can be sustained in the community. If we lose Key Services where will that leave us?</p>	The level of growth in the borough was established in the Core Strategy. Additional housing is focused on those settlements with a good range of services and facilities to assist in sustainability.	No changes required
	Steve and Sue Brown					<p>I have no difficulty in accepting that RV9a can provide our Community with much needed additional housing but it should be sensitive to existing properties and contribute to maintaining a village atmosphere. More than doubling the 'Risbridge' site with the same access point will just create an urban environment which will be completely out of context to the surrounding area.</p>	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Steve and Sue Brown					<p>My Objection to Proposal RV9a is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 'indicative capacity' is too much housing (in excess of anything in the village) and will positively damage our village. 2. Using the existing access via Risbridge Drive will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. substantially increase traffic movement which will lead to casualties b. Access by emergency services will be impeded if roadway becomes blocked c. noise pollution caused by traffic will be at an unacceptable level d. will significantly reduce the safety of residents and pedestrians using Risbridge Drive e. create severe air pollution which will be detrimental to the health of residents 3. It will urbanise a rural area and as such is out of context to the existing environment 	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required
	Steve and Sue Brown					<p>I accept the roadway in Risbridge Drive being 5.5m wide means that it can legally take ALL VEHICLES that use our highway but had it be 1mm narrower restrictions would apply. Nevertheless the high volume is unacceptable.</p> <p>I would advocate that the proposal be amended to stipulate that any development of the site which increases the capacity of dwellings to anything above what currently exists should be subject to separate motor vehicle access from Mill Road with a cycle/pedestrian only path between the two areas with a suitable sized green space buffer to maintain the tranquil atmosphere of a rural village environment for both.</p> <p>I respectfully ask that any proposed amendment be considered.</p>	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				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	Noted. Archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15780	Rachel and Gary Darvill				no	<p>Objection to RV9b. It would directly effect where I live, and the other residents on Taylors farm I personally think the area proposed is far too small to house 40 dwellings With possibly 2 cars per house and to be in keeping with the surrounding dwellings.</p> <p>The site would look directly over our resident as the trees are not dense, and they are protected so digging and building would probably cause shock to them with an end result of them being inadvertently killed then there would be no barrier.</p> <p>It would cause a vast increase in noise disturbance when building and once the houses are purchased.</p> <p>The school has this year been unable to accommodate families in the village so how would they have facilities for 40 more families.</p>	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage. Suffolk CC indicate that the school would have additional capacity for planned growth.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Rachel and Gary Darvill					<p>The connecting access road is very congested especially at school times and would become increasingly dangerous as people make their way to and from work and school as the road is so narrow and vision is often limited from all the parked cars, also as school and public buses travel at this time quite often a bottle neck occurs where no one can move as the road is too narrow.</p> <p>in the recent rain and in previous years Taylors farm and Dash End Lane suffer with water logging this would only increase if the land was tarmacadem,sewerage and drainage must also be an issue to add that many more houses.</p> <p>I hope my comments which are shared with all residents in Taylors Farm are looked at and thought of when looking at these rural sites.</p> <p>It is definitely NOT wanted on the proposed land at Limes Cottage.</p>	See above	None
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15827	Tim Harbord			MILTON INVESTMENTS LTD & TOTAL PEACH LTD.	yes	The allocation of the two sites in Kedington for residential development is supported. However, for the reasons set out below it is considered that Site (b) should be moved into the short term period when development could take place, i.e. following plan adoption. 2. The adopted Design Brief for Stourmead Close - Site (a) - considers three development options:- Option A which comprises wholesale redevelopment of the site for up to 65 dwellings (i.e. 48 additional dwellings of which 14 would be affordable dwellings); Option B1 which comprises the retention of the existing dwellings (13 bungalows and four semi-detached dwellings fronting Mill Road) and the redevelopment of Stourmead House for a 30-bed care home for the elderly along with a detached dwelling.	The development of both sites in Kedington will need to provide affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS5.	No changes required
	Tim Harbord			MILTON INVESTMENTS LTD & TOTAL PEACH LTD.		This provides a total of one new dwelling and no additional affordable housing; or, Option B2 which comprises the retention of the existing dwellings and the redevelopment of Stourmead House and open land for up to 11 additional dwellings, making a total of 28 dwellings, including 3 affordable dwellings 3. In response to the public consultation on the Design Brief 48 out of 49 respondents who expressed a preference for one or other of the options were in favour of Options B1 or B2. Only one respondent favoured the wholesale redevelopment of the site (Option A). 4. When Stourmead Close was proposed to be allocated in the Rural Sites Allocation: Preferred Options Document the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal advised that the design should make use of the buildings/land within the area and try to increase density in a sustainable and socially acceptable manner. The individual site appraisal (Appendix F) made further references to the need for conversions rather than redevelopment.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Tim Harbord			MILTON INVESTMENTS LTD & TOTAL PEACH LTD.		Under the heading of 'Employment' it stated: 'The site is proposed for conversion, which could incorporate some flats at low cost, however lack of information at this stage makes it difficult to answer'. and under the heading of 'Environmental' it stated: - 'It is unlikely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments, as the majority (emphasis added) of the works are small conversion. However, the proposal should upgrade the existing dwellings to standards set at current.' 5. In summary there is considerable uncertainty as to the number of dwellings that will come forward at Stourmead Close, particularly because the most sustainable options, which are the overwhelming preference of local residents, produce only one new dwelling without any affordable housing (Option B1), or only 11 new dwellings including just 3 affordable dwellings (Option B2).	See above	No changes required
	Tim Harbord			MILTON INVESTMENTS LTD & TOTAL PEACH LTD.		6. In order to provide greater flexibility, given the uncertainty over the number of dwellings that should be developed on the Stourmead Close site, and to ensure the provision of a more meaningful number of affordable housing units within the next 10 years, Site (b), which would have 12 affordable dwellings based upon 30% provision, should be allocated in the short term period, i.e. after plan adoption.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15839	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council			no	<p>Policy RV9: There are now two sites proposed in Kedington, as opposed to the one consulted on in the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options (April 2010). The two sites would allocate a total of 105 houses after 2021. Since the last round of consultations, a Public House has been closed down and is up for sale and the GP Surgery operates on significantly reduced hours, although it is still being referred to in policy as a key part of the village. There has been no firm decision made as to the future of the GP Surgery, which if lost, would significantly impact on the services available in Kedington and residents would have to travel to Haverhill for healthcare provision. The G.P Surgery in Wickhambrook is open for significantly more hours than the one in Kedington, yet Wickhambrook was downgraded to a Local Service Centre. There are no employment opportunities in the Parish of Kedington and most people who live there have to travel at least ten miles to work, impacting on the environment.</p>	The services and facilities in Kedington are looked at alongside those in Haverhill which is in close proximity.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council				<p>The Preferred Options Proposals Map Book for Kedington (Inset 35) and Rural Vision 2031 (p 69-72) still shows fields adjacent to Stonecross Flats (B1061) as Recreational Open Space; this is inaccurate and misleading; these fields have not been used for recreation for many years.</p> <p>Policy RV9a - Risbridge Drive on page 71 of the Rural Vision 2031 states 'access will be via Risbridge Drive'. However, the map shows two places where a vehicle access from Mill Road could be made. If the site is to be densified, then a direct connection for vehicles here, not just pedestrians and cyclists is essential so as to integrate the estate properly into the village. Page 70 of the Rural Vision 2031 states that comments received in relation to the proposed new development were about 'inadequate infrastructure (Risbridge Drive is unsuitable for additional traffic), yet the plan proceeds disregarding the 2nd biggest consultation response and clearly stipulates that access to the Stourmead development will be via Risbridge Drive.</p>	The area of land adjacent to StoneCross Flats has been removed as recreational open space and designated as countryside in the Policies Map. Suffolk CC state that development could be supported and would need a transport assessment. Access to the sites would be determined in a site development brief.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council				<p>A Section 106 agreement should be built in that forces the road infrastructure to service this development directly to Haverhill Road (the previous access road), which should be re-instated. Also, visibility at the junction of Mill Road and the B1061 would need to be improved as part of the developer' contribution. Residents in the village are already experiencing problems with their children getting into the local Primary School in Kedington, with some being offered primary school education in Hundon; this means that very young children have to travel between 6 - 8 miles per day (in taxis where parents cannot drive).</p> <p>Policy RV9b - Limes Cottage allocated for 40 houses. This would increase the burden of traffic on Church Hill and Mill Road beyond what the existing narrow roads can handle. This area is already highly congested at peak times. A significantly smaller density of houses would be required for this site.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council				Rural Vision 2031, 2.3 Kedington; 23.5 Constraints and opportunities mentions the 'scale of growth will be dependent on local environmental and infrastructure capacity'; both of the proposed sites RV9a and RV9b will have a massive impact on the environment and the present infrastructure which is crumbling from roads to sewers. One member of the Parish Council who lives on Sturmer Road had raw sewerage down his drive just a few weeks ago and this was not the first time this has happened. The Councillor was speaking with the Engineer from Anglian Water whilst the main sewer was being unblocked and the Engineer noticed there was a large amount of shingle being drawn down the pipe, which indicates the sewerage system is collapsing. A vast amount of money needs to be invested in the sewerage system in Kedington to bring it up to present standards; failure to do this will only speed up the failure process of the current system.	Further information on infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required
	Marion Farrant	Kedington Parish Council				Have the additional new houses in the Parish that have been granted planning permission over the last few years been accounted for when calculating the numbers for RV9a and RV9b?	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement.	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	As all previous answers	Previous comments have been considered	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15928	J Bradford & R Wells					<p>Site Ref RVGA StourMead Complex Kedington</p> <p>With regard to Stourmead Complex to build 65 houses. It is far too many for this site, its like creating another village within a village, if the traffic comes out onto Mill Road it will make it a very dangerous road. Its already very busy and fast and would be dangerous getting out of our drive. Also note the problem the people at the bridge in Mill Road have with raw sewage coming up every so often that needs to be sorted first. We live in Mill Road with our house backing onto the proposed site we shall lose our privacy and peace and being overloaded by houses. Lets keep our village a village so not to 65 houses on Stourmead but also greed will prevail by the builders.</p>	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV9a, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Site RV9b should be subject to predetermination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). Pupil forecasts indicate that there will probably be sufficient space at the primary school to accommodate the proposed level of growth. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of these sites remain valid.	Noted. Archaeological investigations will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(b) We are currently awaiting the results of an ecological survey of this site. We therefore request that we be allowed to make further comments when we are in receipt of the survey information, this is likely to be by the end of May 2012.	Noted. Ecological surveys have been completed and site has been shown to be of medium ecological value. These issues will be taken into account at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no	As mentioned above, most new housing will be occupied by commuters to Cambridge or Bury, as is already the case. Location should be on the edge of the village or have direct access to B1061 and/or A143. The question of water supply, broadband access and local employment need to be addressed before any development is considered.	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement. The infrastructure requirements are dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21585E	Rob Hopwood	Bidwells	Andrew Kiddy		no	<p>Kedington Inset 35</p> <p>Delete hatched yellow area from the top north west corner of the Kedington Inset Map 35 which adjoins the settlement boundary. This should be deleted as this land in fact does not constitute recreational open space as the land in question has been in agricultural crop production for the last 17 years. It is private land which is not used for public purposes. The landowner has no intention of proposing recreation on this site. The 'recreational open space' designation needs to be deleted and a green colour 'countryside' needs to be inserted.</p> <p>It is quite obvious that all other yellow 'recreational open space' on the Kedington Inset map has the label 'playing field' or 'school primary school' referenced on the Inset map. There needs to be consistency on the Inset map in the interests of good planning. (A plan indicating this yellow will be emailed separately. See attachment)</p>	Agree that this land is no longer in recreational use and should be returned to countryside.	The recreational area has been removed and is designated as countryside.
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes	I am concerned at the level of housing proposed - will the infrastructure be sufficient - will the school have enough places? Can the sewerage system cope?	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement. Suffolk CC have indicated there are sufficient school places. Further information on infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this document.	No changes required
RVR21697E	Milton Investments Ltd. & Total Peach Ltd.		Tim Harbord	Tim Harbord Associates	yes	Support the allocation of both sites in Kedington, but consider that Site (b) should be moved into the short term period when development could take place, i.e. following plan adoption. See accompanying statement for reasons.	The site remains phased as medium term to encourage the development of the brownfield site at Stourmead.	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no	This proposal is overdevelopment of a small site currently part of the countryside. It is unsympathetic to the wildlife and will be detrimental to the conservation of the area. There should be tighter planning rules in the local area in any case - the house which was recently granted permission on Dash End Lane is an eyesore and does not reflect the rural character and history of the area. There is not enough infrastructure within the locality to enable this development. The Limes is a key Victorian villa which should be locally listed, and this development would detract from the house. There will be a loss of daylight to the houses on Taylors Farm Road, of which ours is one.	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping.	No changes required
RVR21756E	Frank Phillips				no	I object to the proposal relating to land at Limes Cottage and adjoining land for the following reasons: 1. The site lies outside the existing housing settlement boundary (see Q28 below). 2. The site is said to be of no agricultural value but is currently a haven for wildlife. 3. A number of trees on the boundary of the site are the subject of tree preservation orders. 4. Development on the periphery of the village would set a dangerous precedent for the future and be to the detriment of the character of the village. 5. The proposed development would increase the risk of flooding in an area already prone to flood during periods of heavy rainfall resulting in major inconvenience and road safety concerns.	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. An ecological survey has been undertaken the results of which will help inform the development brief.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 27: Kedington (RV9)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 27a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?	Question 27b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Frank Phillips					<p>6. This unspoiled area of Kedington is used by a large number of residents for walking and other recreational purposes.</p> <p>7. Entry to this part of the village is gained via one of two restricted access bridges, both of which are in hazardous locations, generating serious problems during peak traffic times.</p> <p>8. Additional residential and service traffic generated would enter and leave the village by driving past the village school. This area is already over-congested at critical times of the day and such development would pose a serious risk to children arriving at and leaving the school.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no	As all previous answers	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Noted	None
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no	It will add an unacceptable amount of traffic to roads that are little better than lanes, with consequent danger to schoolchildren at peak travel times. You should also note that the major alteration (Limes Meadow) is on the NORTHERN not southern boundary. The alteration on the southern boundary, as identify by your staff on 12/03/12 would appear only to protect two or three gardens from development. Limes Meadow being taken into the housing settlement area was not even mentioned.	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				yes	Yes but disagree with indicative housing capacity of 40 homes for RV9b; this would overwhelm local roads which already struggle under weight of traffic at peak times. Max limit should be much lower, say 20 houses.	The capacity is indicative. A development brief is required for the site which will determine the amount of land available for development, access and design and landscaping. A transport assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21585E	Rob Hopwood	Bidwells	Andrew Kiddy		no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21697E	Milton Investments Ltd. & Total Peach Ltd.		Tim Harbord	Tim Harbord Associates	yes	Amendment is necessary to accommodate the inclusion of Site (b) which is bordered on three sides by development that is within the current Housing Settlement Boundary. Its other side is screened from open countryside by a belt of protected trees. As such the site is quite distinct in visual terms from the countryside surrounding the village which would continue to be protected by remaining outside the revised boundary.	Noted. The site will be included within the housing settlement boundary	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 28: Kedington Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 28a - Do you agree with the proposed housing settlement boundary?	Question 28b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no	Kedington is already massively overdeveloped with far too many poorly designed modern houses already granted planning permission. The roads are small and access can be limited. The local amenities are limited and may become fewer with government cuts. There is no enough infrastructure to take any more homes.	The housing is allocated on the basis of the infrastructure and environmental capacity of each settlement.	No changes required
RVR21756E	Frank Phillips				no	The existing housing settlement boundary should remain unaltered as building in this area would substantially alter the character of the village and deprive residents of their current amenities.	Noted. The sites will be included within the housing settlement boundary	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation of the southern part attached to any planning consent. (The northern half of RV18a has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area)	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council				Decision on RA2a should be made in week of May 15th 2012 so little point in any consultation on that policy, just setting hares running again. Improvements to pedestrian and cycle crossing on A143, this has been a problem for many years and also covers villagers from South of A143 visiting other facilities to the North of the A143, probably only new development North of A143 will justify 'and pay for' improvements.	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012. Footpath improvements are noted in the document as an aspiration.	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15855	Mrs Audrey Hubbard	Stanton Parish Council			yes	Stanton Parish Council has had the opportunity to see the draft proposals put forward by Carisbrooke Investments Ltd for the development of land at Shepherds Grove Industrial Estate, comprising the site of the IKEA planning application that was approved in July 2006. In that the proposals would resolve the long standing problems of road safety (both on A143 and in our village) and direct access for HGV's to the industrial estate from the A143 we would like to express our support in principle. Stanton Parish Council understands that the development of this site will be reliant on creating the access road that will be able to link both the East & West Shepherds Grove Industrial Areas and appreciate that such infrastructure will be a costly part of any future development of the land.	The potential high cost of providing the infrastructure required for the development of this site is acknowledged, but is necessary for the delivery of this large site. However, details of how this may be delivered, whether in a single provision, or a phased delivery will need to be the subject of further, detailed analysis.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs Audrey Hubbard	Stanton Parish Council				We therefore believe that the Council should adopt a more flexible approach in their proposed planning policy for this site, which should recognise that employment uses alone are unlikely to bring forward visible development proposals (that meet the Council's requirements for access) in the current economic recession. The Carisbrooke proposals which were presented to us at our meeting on 12th April 2012, merit serious consideration. They include elements of higher value commercial uses to subsidise the high infrastructure costs associated with the development of the site. Stanton Parish Council would support in principle the concept, provided that the new roundabout and access roads to both existing industrial estates are built and completed as a 1st Phase of any development of the site.	This would include discussion around viability. As has been alluded to in the observation, the highway requirements are based upon a scheme approved for the delivery of a specific proposal, which was considered economically viable. A future alternative proposal may prove economically viable.	No changes required
	Mrs Audrey Hubbard	Stanton Parish Council				The Carisbrooke proposals which were presented to us at our meeting on 12th April 2012, merit serious consideration. They include elements of higher value commercial uses to subsidise the high infrastructure costs associated with the development of the site. Stanton Parish Council would support in principle the concept, provided that the new roundabout and access roads to both existing industrial estates are built and completed as a 1st Phase of any development of the site.	See above	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	RV10a The Society strongly objects to this allocation that would harm the setting of the adjacent grade II* listed mill.	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Stanton (Shepherd's Grove) is the largest rural employment area in the Borough (53ha of developable land). Development of this area could bring significant benefits to the village, through a new access and roundabout junction on the A143, which would remove HGV traffic from the village. These proposals are supported in principle by the Parish Council's concerned (Stanton and Hepworth). As the largest employment site allocation in the rural areas, the provision of new jobs and businesses would be a sustainable option by reducing out-commuting from the villages. WHY is there no mention of this important employment site in this section??	Agree that reference should be made to the employment allocation	Amend supporting text to include reference to Shepherd's Grove
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV10a), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. (The southern half of RV10 has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area) Pupil forecasts indicate that there will probably be sufficient space at the primary school to accommodate the proposed level of growth. Please note that the future of the Blackbourne Middle School site is yet to be decided, and will be consulted on in the near future. The county council would favour an educational or community use, over redevelopment. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of these sites remain valid.	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) It is understood that a development proposal for this site is currently that subject of a planning appeal. Although the existing proposal did not include the development of the rough grassland in the north of the site, should any development be proposed here in the future we recommend that reptile surveys are carried out.	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012. Other ecological issues noted.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Ends to cope with extra density of traffic being made eg Otterwill Road Bridge	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no	A143 highway implications	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 29: Stanton (RV10)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 29a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?	Question 29b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15822	Jim Thorndyke	St. Edmundsbury Borough Council			no	Removal of these boundaries is unacceptable, sustainability objectives are met as well here as in many smaller villages retaining boundaries, shops, busses etc exist but are not taken into account in your appraisal and as yet you have not designated any area for medium/long term housing development in Stanton. Some 37% of the Stanton electorate live outside the village centre boundary but most live in an existing housing settlement boundary and they all live in the parish of Stanton. Sole aim of this policy appears to stifle any future development and mothball the rural areas.	The settlement boundaries have been reinstated as it is considered there are other policies in the Local Plan which can defend development in these location if required.	Reinstate deleted settlement boundaries at Grove Park and north of Stanton on the Policies Map
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15855	Mrs Audrey Hubbard	Stanton Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society wishes to see RV10a Upthorpe Road excluded from development as above.	The planning appeal was allowed in May 2012.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15868	Paul Sutton	Cheffins	Nic Rumsey	Carisbrooke Investments Ltd	no	Object to deletion of settlement boundaries for outlying areas of Stanton north of the A143 and at Stanton Grove Park. Stanton clearly has a defined centre and core area, but there are clearly settlement areas on the outskirts of the village that should be part of a defined settlement boundary. This is justified by the fact that Stanton is the largest Key Service Centre in the Borough and, outside of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, is the most sustainable location for new development. Stanton (Shepherd's Grove) also represents the largest defined rural employment area (53ha) and will be a key aspect of the objective to reduce out-commuting from villages by providing additional jobs and business opportunities on their outskirts.	The settlement boundaries have been reinstated as it is considered there are other policies in the Local Plan which can defend development in these location if required.	Reinstate deleted settlement boundaries at Grove Park and north of Stanton on the Policies Map
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion	However significant development will have an adverse effect on the traffic on the A143.	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 30: Stanton Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 30a - Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 30b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no	Although the Shepherds Grove Park site is located away from the centre of the village, this does not mean that it is in an unsustainable location. It is served by a bus service and is within walking/cycling distance of the services in the village centre and the employment opportunities on the industrial estate. Residents of the park are not reliant on the car for access to services.	The settlement boundaries have been reinstated as it is considered there are other policies in the Local Plan which can defend development in these location if required.	Reinstate deleted settlement boundaries at Grove Park and north of Stanton on the Policies Map
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15768	Nigel Webber Home Farm		R Davison	Lacy Scott and Knight	no	Object. Promoting site at Street Farm Bardwell. A flood risk assessment and ecological survey have been undertaken to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. Hope that this will provide sufficient detail for the site to be included in the updated preferred options document. A recent presentation was made to Bardwell Parish Council at their last meeting to show how possibly the site might be sympathetically developed and I await a response from them. Attach a copy of the possible scheme that would include provision of affordable housing. Attach a copy of letter from the Environment Agency. (See attachments)	This site was has been proposed a number of times as a site submission. It is not considered appropriate due to the distance of the site from the main services and facilities and development of the site would be damaging to the street scene. Other better located sites lie within Bardwell.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no	<p>The Parish Council is very pleased that the Borough took note of submissions regarding proposals for two sites adjacent to The Green in Bardwell, that these have been removed and are not present in these latest proposals. (Ticked yes) Please see comments under Q6 regarding the settlement boundary in Low Street</p> <p>The settlement boundary in Low Street Bardwell excludes two barn properties that were converted a few years ago. Further development/exception site has been previously rejected due to objections relating to flooding and environmental issues. It is understood these may now have been overcome and the Parish Council has received a presentation for a projected small development at Street Farm on which we have the following comments: -</p> <p>The scheme as described is interesting, well thought out, a good mix of properties and sympathetic to the surrounding area.</p>	The site at Street Farm Bardwell has been proposed a number of times as a site submission. I is not considered appropriate due to the distance of the site from the main services and facilities and development of the site would be damaging to the street scene. Other better located sites lie within Bardwell.	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council				<p>Councillors are aware that plans could alter significantly during the planning process and, therefore, the Parish Council is currently unable to confirm at this stage whether or not it will support development at Street Farm. However, if/when a formal planning application is submitted to St Edmundsbury Borough Council, then the Parish Council will be invited to respond/make observations, and will consider its decision based on the plans submitted at that time along with other relevant details.</p> <p>There are major concerns relating to the poor water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure in this area, heightened by a significant number of planning applications which have already been granted or have been submitted. If a formal application is made the Parish Council would require assurances that extensive relevant research is carried out before any further planning permission is granted.</p> <p>In view of this consideration should therefore be given to extending the settlement boundary to encompass this area.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)				We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				yes	Adding a small scale development, the British Legion land, to the Spring rd development should enhance the village without significantly adding too much to traffic to the village and the A143. Keeping any new development within the established boundaries should mean no additional flood and road safety issues.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made eg Otterwill Road Bridge	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21724E	Jane Allum	Addison Farms			no	Bardwell is a great community village and we feel strongly against the decision not to allocate the two sites for future development. The village needs growth to sustain the school, the public houses, post office and regular bus services. The site 7.1b proposed land behind The Green has good access in and out and would make use of redundant farm buildings. As The Green is a focal, central point of the village surely a few tastefully designed family houses would be better surrounding the village green than the old asbestos building that currently exists. Site 7.1a also is a good central position with easy access in and out. We feel that both sites should not be dismissed and should be considered with fewer units.	There are other sites in the housing settlement boundary which could come forward in the plan period which are more appropriate and meet the housing needs.	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 31: Bardwell**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 31a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up to 2031?	Question 31b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21766E	Sally Ruffles				no	Bardwell needs more houses to encourage people into the village and to help sustain the facilities it is already lucky to have i.e. the school, public houses, post office and regular bus services. With extra housing targeted around the village green it will make the village more desirable, without "over development". The proposed areas could be considered for fewer units which would allow a slow and steady growth encouraging more inhabitants but not over-stretching its existing facilities.	The opportunities for small scale growth in the village have been assessed and there are sites within the housing settlement boundary which are likely to come forward in the plan period.	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15754	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>It should be noted that the Proposals Map Plan and SHLAA schedule for site 7.2 (AS15) should be amended to reflect the actual extent of land ownership here. A plan of the site is attached.</p> <p>Looking at the site specific policy wording for Barningham first published in April 2010, this states that the development was due to be first occupied in 2011. As such the proposed development is already 2 years late and will be further delayed while the Rural Vision process continues through a policy making process lasting a total of 6 years from 2008 to 2014. Given that the proposals include 6 local needs affordable homes it would be unfortunate that such a beneficial resource for the village is being delayed by an elongated planning process. Hopkins & Moore proposes to submit a planning application in the shorter term following further community consultation.</p>	Site areas are not defined on the extent of land ownership but on the requirements in terms of dwellings and associated facilities.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>This process based delay in respect of a site which has been the subject of several rounds of consultation does not sit comfortably with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which has been published since the latest rural consultation commenced. The NPPF states "Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision." Furthermore, paragraph 14 of the NPPF emphasises that Local Planning Authorities should already be "approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are outofdate, granting permission...". Paragraph 15 states "Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay.</p>	<p>If an application is submitted for a site which is not yet allocated the applicant will need to justify why the site should be brought forward ahead of the Local Plan.</p>	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>Paragraph 182 states "local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an uptodate Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible".</p> <p>Although Hopkins & Moore welcomees the 3rd endorsement of this site in 3 years, it is considered that the text of the Rural Vision should be more consistent with the draft Policy RV11. The Rural Vision (in draft form) is published 2 years after the Site Specific Preferred Options Document which should have been a precursor to a planning application and the delivery of the site. The Rural Vision document, at paragraph 26.15, states "One site was proposed for development (site 7.2a) in the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document (April 2010). The situation, in terms of the availability and deliverability of this site remains unchanged and having taken into account the consultation comments received it is considered that this site is still proposed for development as set out in the draft policy below"</p>	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>However, looking back at the LDF Preferred Options Document 2010 this refers to the Hopton Road site as follows: "7.2.3 A number of sites for Barningham were proposed by landowners for development. After consultation at the Issues and Options stages in 2008 and 2009, site 7.2a was considered the most appropriate location for development as it has good access and is close to the village centre....</p> <p>7.2.4 The site being proposed as the preferred option for new housing in the village and is set out in the table ... below:</p> <p>Table 7.2 Barningham proposed site allocation</p> <p>Map Ref Location Area (ha) Use Phasing Indicative capacity 7.2a (AS15) Hopton Rd 0.7 Residential 2011 2031</p>	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				Residential development on the site will only be permitted after the phasing date shown." In addition, the 2010 Preferred Options Document states at paragraph 7.2.6 that "Affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the thresholds set out in Core strategy Policy CS5". Given that Paragraph 26.15 of the Rural Vision document states that "The situation, in terms of the availability and deliverability of this site remains unchanged.." it is unclear what is intended by the addition of paragraph 26.16. It seems that these two paragraphs potentially conflict with each other and with the Policy RV11. Paragraph 26.16 states "It has been identified that part of this site is suitable for an affordable scheme and so will be brought forward as a housing exception site which will lie outside the housing settlement boundary. This will need to be taken into account in terms of the access to the site which is likely to be shared".	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				In order to achieve a deliverable and viable residential development site Hopkins and Moore would clarify that it is intended to deliver 20 homes of which 6 would be affordable homes. Paragraph 26.16 potentially proposes a disproportionate number of affordable homes by referring to the affordable housing as an exceptions site falling within the area of the allocated site. If affordable housing is proposed on this basis then it would lead to 6 affordable homes being built within the allocated site but outside of the settlement boundary and thereafter 30% (or 4 No.) of the remaining 14 homes also being affordable. This would suggest total affordable housing here of 50% which would be disproportionately in the context of "need" and making the development economically. Clearly, an exceptions site cannot be allocated in this way because it is no longer an exception	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				It is therefore, Hopkins & Moore's firm submission that paragraph 26.16 should be deleted because it is in conflict with the wording of Policy RV11a "Affordable housing on site (a) must meet the requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS5". Without this change there would be inconsistency here. Hopkins & Moore is committed to delivering this development without delay and with CS5 policy compliant affordable housing to satisfy local needs. The details of the precise tenure and occupancy criteria can be determined via the wording of any S106 agreement associated with any subsequent planning application, rather than sought to be addressed at this stage.	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				Given the relatively small size of the site, the need for, and suggested location of, public open space is queried. In this instance, it is considered that greater community benefit would be derived from a Section 106 contribution to be made for enhancement of existing local facilities within the village, rather than any small physical provision of open space directly adjacent to the B1111 within the proposed housing area. The relatively small size of the site and the acknowledgement that the site can be delivered immediately cast in doubt the need for, and value of, a 'Development Brief' to be produced and agreed by the Borough Council, prior to the formal submission of any planning application. Recent experiences have shown that the submission, and agreement, of Development Briefs adds another year and significant cost to the process.	The sketch plan is indicative only. Requirements for open space will be dealt with at the planning application stage. The requirement for a development brief has been removed.	The requirement for a development brief has been removed from the policy.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>Where a small, single use, single access development is proposed on a greenfield site with no obvious physical constraints, a Development Brief would have no useful purpose. This view is backed up by Government research and advice. "Planning and Development Briefs: A Guide to Better Practice"</p> <p>In this instance, Policy RV11 states "On site (a) the amount of land available for development, location of uses, access arrangements, design and landscaping will be informed by a site Development Brief. Application for planning permission will only be considered once the Development Brief has been agreed by the local planning authority". However the land available for development is 0.76 Hectares, there is only a single use (residential), there is only a single access point, and the design and landscaping would be to the high standards set by Hopkins & Moore. In Summary it is requested that the following changes to the Policy RV11 and its associated plan and text: April 2012</p>	See above	See above
	Christopher Smith	Hopkins Homes Ltd				<p>Delete – Paragraph 26.16</p> <p>Delete - the words in Policy RV11 "On site (a) the amount of land available for development, location of uses, access arrangements, design and landscaping will be informed by a site Development Brief. Application for planning permission will only be considered once the Development Brief has been agreed by the local planning authority."</p> <p>Amend - the plan of RV11a in accord with the land owner and developer plan.</p> <p>Delete "And Open Space" from the last line of the policy dated August 2011</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Noted. This will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15798	Louise Wilby	Suffolk Acre			yes	Suffolk ACRE supports the policy but in addition would like consideration to be taken and as preferred by the Parish council, of the local needs affordable housing as mentioned in the Rural Vision document under paragraph 26.10 and especially 26.16 to be included in the future development of the site on Hopton road. The local needs affordable housing would be in addition to the requirement required in the Core Strategy. Although the development is proposed in the document as to be taken forward in the short term, the local needs housing needs to be progressed as soon as possible and ideally before the plan adoption.	Provision has been made in the policy for access to a potential exception site for affordable housing on adjoining land.	Change made to policy to reflect need to retain point of dual access to exception site on adjoining land

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15820	William Lusty	Savills	Mrs Stamper			<p>On behalf of my client Mrs Stamper, I write in relation to the above consultation. As you will be aware, our client is the owner of land identified under Policy RV11 Barningham of the Rural Vision document for the development of 20 dwellings. Our client is working with the housebuilder, Hopkins & Moore (Developments) Ltd., to bring forward development of the site. We understand that Hopkins & Moore will also be making representations to this consultation and we lend our support to those representations. Site RV11 is identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as Site 7.2a. We made submissions to the recent SHLAA consultation to confirm that Site 7.2a / RV11 remains available for development and that we consider development of the site to be deliverable. We therefore support the Council's continued endorsement of this site and the proposed allocation of Site RV11 in the Rural Vision 2031 document.</p>	Support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	William Lusty	Savills	Mrs Stamper			<p>However, we have two concerns in relation to Policy RV11 and its supporting text. The first relates to Paragraph 26.16, which refers to part of the site being suitable for affordable housing exception site development. This is not proposed. In accordance with the Council's Core Strategy, 6 of the 20 dwellings will be brought forward as affordable units. As such, the affordable element of the development will not be brought forward on the basis of exception site policies, but as integral part of the development. Paragraph 26.16 should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>Our second concern relates to the requirement for agreement of a Development Brief with the Council. This is a relatively unconstrained site with no significant, specific planning considerations. Also, Hopkins & Moore is already discussing development of the site with the local community. It is therefore considered that the requirement to prepare and agree a Development Brief with the Council will unnecessarily delay and add cost to the delivery of this site.</p>	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted	Paragraph 2.16 has been deleted

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	William Lusty	Savills	Mrs Stamper			<p>This requirement should therefore be deleted from Policy RV11.</p> <p>In addition to Site RV11 and as you will be aware from our recent SHLAA submission, our client also owns land to the south-east of Site RV11. I enclose a plan which shows Site RV11 (7.2a) in red and land to the south-east of Site RV11 edged in blue.</p> <p>This additional land is circa 1 Ha and was also the subject of submissions to the Council in June 2010 and 2011.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Council's housing delivery projections over-estimate the amount of housing development that will be delivered on sites in and around Bury St Edmunds, during the early part of the plan period. Specifically, the Council's Included Sites Schedule projects that 641 dwellings will be completed on brownfield sites in Bury St Edmunds in the next five years. On greenfield sites at Bury St Edmunds, a figure of 650 dwellings is identified. Broadly, these sites are either brownfield or strategic scale developments.</p>	An assessment of the environmental and infrastructure capacity of Barningham has been undertaken which has helped determined the number of dwellings in line with the villages status as a Local Service Centre. It would not be appropriate to increase the number of dwellings in this plan period.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	William Lusty	Savills	Mrs Stamper			By their nature, these sites will take a long time to deliver and will be built out over the plan period. We suggest that a more realistic figure might be in the order of 800 - 900 dwellings across brownfield and greenfield sites at Bury St Edmunds during the first five years of the plan period. To compensate for this slower delivery during the earlier part of the plan period, we consider that greater amounts of development should be directed to the Rural Area, where typically there is greater certainty of early delivery of housing development. Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres, such as Barningham, would be sustainable locations for this growth. This approach would be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a key objective of which is to deliver growth. As such, the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to plan positively and also flexibly to account for rapid change.	See above	No changes required
	William Lusty	Savills	Mrs Stamper			Turning specifically to Barningham, we consider that the additional land proposed by this representation is the most suitable opportunity of those that are available to accommodate this growth. We therefore propose that the additional land should be allocated in the Rural Vision 2031, in addition to Site RV11. Site RV11 and the additional land could be brought forward as a single comprehensive development. (See attached plan)	See above	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15858	Clare Stamper				yes	<p>I write in response to the Rural Vision 2031 as it relates to the proposed allocation of site RV11a (Formerly site 7.2a) for residential development.</p> <p>Barningham is one of the more sustainable Local Centres within this part of the Borough and it is clearly able to sustain additional new housing which, in turn, will support local facilities and services and increase the supply and range of family housing.</p> <p>The Hopton Road site is the best opportunity to achieve the necessary housing growth and, as land owner here I have teamed up with a local premium homes developer Hopkins & Moore (Developments) Ltd to deliver this site including 6 affordable homes.</p> <p>The provision of a high quality development including affordable housing designed in a sympathetic, sustainable, and inclusive way will be an enduring and attractive addition to the village.</p>	The support is welcomed and comments are noted.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Clare Stamper					<p>Looking the policy and its supporting words it is important to clarify that the site size is actually 0.76 Hectares and that Hopkins & Moore is working on proposals to deliver the site in the short term. The delivery of the site would be on the basis of 6 affordable homes to be managed and transferred to a Registered Social Landlord with a further 14 private homes. It is important that the mix of homes is right in terms of type and tenure so that the development remains viable.</p> <p>Whilst writing I would confirm that I share Hopkins & Moore's aspirations that this will be an excellent development. However, we agree that the delivery of a relatively straight forward and small scale project would be unreasonably delayed in the event that the policy retained its insistence that a Development Brief be prepared and approved. The site is already delayed beyond the 2011 date fixed for its completion.</p>	Site areas are not defined on the extent of land ownership but on the requirements in terms of dwellings and associated facilities.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Clare Stamper					<p>The Rural Vision Area Action Plan is not expected to be adopted until the middle of 2014 and this delay to the planning process cannot be tolerated particularly in view of the Government's intention to 'boost the supply of housing'. The new NPPF states 'Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay - a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision'. The NPPF also emphasises that 'Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay'.</p> <p>Hopkins & Moore will be preparing plans for pre-application consultation with a view to submitting an application for full planning permission this year.</p>	If an application is submitted for a site which is not yet allocated the applicant will need to justify why the site should be brought forward ahead of the Local Plan.	No changes required
RVR15859	Edward Gittins	Edward Gittins and Associates			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				<p>The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.</p>	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic 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. Pupil forecasts indicate that there will probably be sufficient space at the primary school to accommodate the proposed level of growth. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid; i.e. that a full safety audit will be required. Improvements to the safety of the B1111 would be welcomed.	Comments are noted. The need for a safety audit and improvements to the B1111 have been referenced in the supporting text	Make reference to need for a safety audit and improvements to the B1111 in the supporting text

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21502E	Vicki E Gay	Barningham Parish Council			yes	The Parish Council are pleased to note that our concerns regarding infrastructure (roads, sewage) are being taken into account. Also that you have made provision to include our allocation for affordable housing within the proposed development location.	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made eg Otterwill Road Bridge	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 32: Barningham (RV11)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 32a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?	Question 32b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15752	James Vosper				no	I strongly object to the consideration of the identified site for any proposed development. Apart from the inadequate infrastructure to serve additional buildings, for example heavily overloaded sewage services and extremely narrow existing roads, the designated site appears to fall within the existing conservation area. It encroaches across a long established foot path and contains badgers sets. Furthermore there still seems to be difficulties in filling housing on the Nether Road site, the most recently completed development here, do we really need more houses in this area?	An assessment of the environmental and infrastructure capacity of Cavendish has been undertaken which has helped determine the number of dwellings to be provided in the period up to 2031 in line with the villages status as a Local Service Centre. Issues such as road access and the Conservation Area designation were taken into account in the early stages of designating this site and there are no overriding issues which prevent this site from coming forward.	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15833	A. Round-Turner					A development on site RV12a would result in increased traffic to and from the site in an area which is used frequently by pedestrians, including children and people walking dogs on the footpaths.	Suffolk County Highways have stated that up to 10 dwellings on the site would be supported in terms of highway capacity. The footpaths around the site are to be protected wherever possible as stated in the policy.	Include sentence in policy to help maintain existing informal footpaths
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15859	Edward Gittins	Edward Gittins and Associates			no	<p>We set out below our concerns in relation to the selection and release of land forming Site RV12a.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We note that an alternative site, namely Site 7.3a Land opposite Nether Hall, is no longer supported due to site access issues and the fact that the site is said to be more remote from the village services and facilities than the other site proposed. (Paragraph 27.13). We would need to be convinced that site access problems are insuperable whilst there is little to choose between the sites in terms of access to services. 2. The text indicates Cavendish has the benefit of a Post Office which is no longer the case. 3. The release of Site RV12a will urbanise the well used public footpath leading from St Mary's Church to the Bowling Green, Allotments and Water Lane. The section of this footpath to the north of Orchard House provides extensive views north and north eastwards across open landscape forming the slopes of the Stour Valley. 	Suffolk County Highways have stated that 10 dwellings on the site would be supported. Noted that Post Office service no longer exists. Informal footpaths on the site will be maintained where possible	Update villages and services section to reflect loss of post office. Sentence included in policy to retain existing informal footpaths wherever possible.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Edward Gittins	Edward Gittins and Associates				<p>Development in the immediate vicinity of the footpath in this location will urbanise the currently rural aspect and obscure wider views to the north. The amenity of persons passing along this well used footpath will be diminished.</p> <p>4. The high wall along this same footpath has a short eastern section at the northern end of the grounds of Orchard House. This section of the wall currently follows the line of the Housing Settlement Boundary which runs alongside The Maltings, The Counting House and The Old Rectory. Both the Counting House and The Old Rectory are Listed Buildings, (the former being Deemed Listed), and the wall around the northern and western sides of Orchard House is physically connected to The Old Rectory. It is therefore considered that this fine wall forming the boundary of Orchard House is itself Listed. Development directly in front of part of this wall will be harmful to its setting and this in itself is a material planning consideration.</p>	Development will not breach the existing wall.	Refer to existing wall in supporting text.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Edward Gittins	Edward Gittins and Associates				<p>5. The release of this Greenfield site will urbanise a corner of the village which already enjoys clear defensible boundaries provided by the existing Housing Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>6. The eastern section of Nether Road is narrow and the improvements needed to serve the proposed development will be difficult to implement.</p> <p>7. Final decisions should await and take account of the findings of an Ecological Survey.</p> <p>8. A capacity of 10 units on a net developable area of 0.37ha would result in a housing density of 27 units per hectare which is too high having regard to the general character of the immediately surrounding area.</p> <p>Finally, without prejudice to the above, we consider that if the development site is to be released, provisions should be in place relating to the delivery and future management of the proposed associated open space.</p>	An assessment of the environmental and infrastructure capacity of Cavendish has been undertaken which has helped determine the number of dwellings to be provided in the period up to 2031 in line with the villages status as a Local Service Centre. Issues such as road access and the Conservation Area designation were taken into account in the early stages of designating this site and there are no overriding issues which prevent this site from coming forward.	No changes required
	Edward Gittins	Edward Gittins and Associates				<p>Furthermore, the line of a permissive footpath should be provided along the southern edge of the development within a buffer of land which would also protect the setting of the Listed wall. This route is already a well used, unofficial footpath of long standing and should be formally incorporated into the development proposals.</p>	Detailed issues like these would be considered at the time of a planning application	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15922	Ron Hilditch				yes	1. Existing badger sett on the site 2. What safeguards are being put in place to preserve the listed wall adjacent to the proposed development?	The wall adjacent to the site is within the curtilidge of the listed building. Any development on this site will not affect this wall. An ecological survey would be required on site prior to any development taking place.	Reference to the need for an ecological survey is made in the supporting text

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV12a, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Pupil forecasts indicate that there will probably be sufficient space at the primary school to accommodate the proposed level of growth. 12 Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	The comments are noted.	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) Protected species have been recorded on this site (please refer to Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2010). Opportunities for retaining protected species on site should be explored.	Ecological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	Reference to the need for an ecological survey is made in the supporting text
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21606E	Tony MacDonald				yes	Your question above refers to RV11 when it should read RV12. Local facilities are very limited. There is no Post Office facilities available although you state that there are. Please ensure that FULL planning permission is obtained before any building works go ahead. Your document states that there will be 10 dwellings on the site, however the poster at the location states 14. Please clarify.	Noted that Post Office facilities no longer available. Proposal is for 10 dwellings	Update villages and services section to reflect loss of Post Office

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21617E	A Williamott				no	<p>There has been no updating of the village services The visiting post office and associated shop ceased to trade in December 2010, this leaves only one community shop providing a daily service to residents. Other establishments provide trade for tourists.</p> <p>The Opportunities and Constraints document identifies this land as within the village conservation area. Different areas are identified as potential development opportunities and in fact one has recently provided 8 social housing dwellings of which no account has been given in the RV document. The shared ownership element is still on the market (and has been for six months).</p>	Noted that Post Office facilities no longer available. New social housing was referred to in para 27.10 of the Rural Vision.	Update villages and services section to reflect loss of Post Office
	A Williamott					<p>No reference has been made to the public footpaths on two sides of this land nor has the remaining side been identified as also being used as a path for some time. These paths are used by many dog walkers and access to allotments and the bowling green.</p> <p>The Highways dept originally responded with support for the development of a private drive and 5 dwellings due to the narrow (4.2m) access road onto the land and bound by existing houses. The report goes on to say that subsequent consultation has indicated that 10 dwellings would be supported. In conversation with the Highways Development Management Team on 24th April, they were unable to agree or deny that this would be the case as their own policies require a 5.5m width and they were currently unable to locate who had given this further assurance.</p>	Suffolk County Highways have stated that 10 dwellings on the site would be supported.	Sentence included in policy to retain existing informal footpaths wherever possible.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	A Williamott					The same Highways department decided that the alternate site put forward in a previous document would be hampered by a narrow access road as a result this has been dropped from the current plan. The plan also indicates that the site was further away from services but this is inaccurate. Based on this and the Highway departments uncertainty, perhaps the alternate site should be re-examined. The Draft Rural vision recommends that new development will have regard to the local environmental and infrastructure capacity. It is well documented that both drainage and traffic problems already exist in this area of the village and additional development would add to the problems. Suffolk Wildlife Trust have identified possible wildlife on this site which should include owls and bats.	Ecological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	Reference to the need for an ecological survey is made in the supporting text
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 33: Cavendish (RV12)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 33a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV12 on Cavendish?	Question 33b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no	This site is accessed by one road which also serves the school, church, a public house 2 farms and several hundreds of houses. There is no alternative access to this site and this is contrary to Suffolk County Council advice which requires 2 points of access. The distance on to bus stops is in excess of 400m on public maintained footways (0.5m wide in places) suitable for use by mobility impaired users which is contrary to policies proposed in this document. This site has O/H power cables and is too low to be drained by gravity and hence would need pumps to be used which is not sustainable in the longer term. Other brownfield sites have been struck out for access reasons that have a better connectivity to the village centre. This site is poorly accessed and the scale of development proposed is too small for the needs of the village. A more ambitious plan that has 2 access points should be substituted.	Suffolk County Highways have stated that 10 dwellings on the site would be supported.	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15716	Mr A Couzens	Chedburgh Parish Council			no	<p>Chedburgh Council feel that Rural Vision 2031 should concentrate on developing the former fireworks factory area with 51 private and affordable homes; also with an amenity area within it. Additionally it is very important to establish a footpath link from this development to the village. This can be achieved by developing a property in The Street known as The Conifers, currently on the market, which has planning permission for 5 bungalows and the required footpath link.</p> <p>This plan for an additional 56 houses in the village on top of the existing 257 homes represents an increase of 22% in the number of homes. Surely this is more than a village, without a school or shop, to sustain. The imposition of a further 10 homes in Queens Lane is not appropriate.</p> <p>It should be pointed out that in the past, the Queens Lane development site has featured as a possible building site, until a Village Appraisal exercise was undertaken by the Parish Council about 10 years ago.</p>	The Rural Vision is for long term growth up to 2031. The site is required to meet long term future housing needs beyond 2026 and after the Fireworks Factory site has been completed.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Couzens	Chedburgh Parish Council				<p>The village appraisal proposed that all future housing developments should be on the former fireworks factory site and not on Queens Lane. This had the widespread support of the villagers and the Borough Council. At that point the Council decided to removed the Queens Lane site from their plans.</p> <p>Over the last 10 years the factory site has finally emerged as the future development site for the village with planning permission given in 2011 for 51 homes. Development is now starting, but it does not seem appropriate for the Council to reinstate the Queens Lane development site into their plans at this stage.</p> <p>The Parish Council have always objected to Chedburgh being designated a Local Service Centre since it has no shop or school. Rural Vision 2031 should only support a few 'in fill' homes once the 56 homes outlined above have been built.</p> <p>All the above points have been made before in meetings and discussions with your planning staff. Although Rural Vision 2031 includes a section on 'what you have told us', there is no evidence that you intend to take any notice of what we have said.</p>	See above	No changes required
	Mr A Couzens	Chedburgh Parish Council				If you intend to ignore the Council's request to have the Queens Land development removed from Rural Vision 2031 then the Council will insist on a full meeting with senior planning officers, where the Council would expect you to fully justify why you want to increase Chedburgh population by more than the 22% already agreed.	Council officers are happy to continue talking with all Parish Councils as the Rural Vision document progresses.	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Noted. This will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15885	Mr A Larwood	Pen & Cane				<p>Pen & Cane. Project 129. Chedburgh. Phase 1. Proposal for housing development of 100+ dwellings. Phase 2 until 2031. Presented 30th April 2012</p> <p>The expertise and interest that the projects has gained over nearly three years is so inspiring that project 128 and 129 are the leaders in the UK as far as bringing Localism into the lives of the public. These projects have been designed 'for the residents, with the residents' concerning the future of housing developments in villages, not just in West Suffolk or East Anglia, but across the nation as a whole. It has brought inspiration not just within Whitehall or No10, but many top offices across the country, but also within the rest of Europe and even further. With this project 129 it enables the residents almost to start again, with it bearing with the public the name of being the ugliest village around. Another name that is used is the council village. I have spoken with people who have moved to another village locally, simple because of how it looks and feels.</p>	The level of housing proposed does not accord with the spatial strategy or the infrastructure and environmental capacity of the village and its status as a Local Service Centre	No changes required
	Mr A Larwood					<p>This model is exceptionally good for the residents of such villages, because they are the people who are asking for the changes and they want to make those changes. With this development, because of their total involvement in the design and planning, they can make those changes for the future of the community. 'With the residents, for the residents'. , Enhancing the environmental issues of this village, because it does not have a wood so close to the village the community will be gaining from the development with the introduction of landscaping and planting around the village and the planning of future woods and footpaths again using such experts as the BTO. Using all the ideas and plans that have been used in planning of project 128. Also a legal team legal team is looking at using this as a way to introducing new standards within policy to make the developers more accountable for the work that has been agreed with the residents and other departments.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					Using the latest plans for housing, services and the future of the homes created, with the latest technology used in all instances. Pen and Cane will only use developers who build to the highest levels of quality and exceeds all the standards, guidelines and policies that apply. As you know we take advice from advisers and consultants to the secretary of state's office, to the authors of government policy on planning, design, new technology and green matters, with the help of the members of Acumen 7 group and so many more.	See above	No changes required
	Mr A Larwood					<p>Social.</p> <p>The site model ticks all the boxes in this matter and adds so much more.</p> <p>It will be the input from the young of the village that determines what amenities they would like to have in their community, shops and extra amenities are a must in this village.</p> <p>Tennis or Basketball courts. Other facilities like a small skate park and other new ideas for the young to keep occupied other than just standing around the village hall.</p> <p>A donation will be made to each of the churches within the parish and some of the adjoining villages.</p> <p>Certain areas of the meadows will be made for public use for the enjoyment of all residents. Hence the re-introduction of the old concept of common ownership.</p> <p>They certainly want to use this intent to raise the future</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					Common ownership. To protect the overall size and to allow for further growth in Chedburgh before 2031, With also the want to emphasises the whole rural vision concept. With making the use of the ownership arrangement for the village. The Village will be able to earn each month from the rental of common ownership property. Which we will set with the developer in the parameters of this build, all income in this model will go straight into the village fund, on the monthly or quarterly basis. The part of the common ownership scheme will enable the residents to set the limit of growth across the village. This common land can be rented out as a farming asset with income, again going in to the Village fund.	See above	No changes required
	Mr A Larwood					Environmental Bringing the flora and fauna closer and into the village area, establishing a large area of meadow land, woods, hedgerows and places for picnics and viewing the wildlife. Included in the green plan for this area will be a dog walking path around the development, providing a walk around the whole site. In these areas there will be nesting boxes of all kinds for the Birds and bat boxes too. This whole area will be planted with a considerable amount of trees, including some arboretum type specimens. It is very important for our butterflies and other insects, that there are quite simply more flowering shrubs and bushes needed. To aid this, a considerable amount of landscaping around the development with breaks across the meadowland, including lots of wildflower seeding going on. The planning for the meadowland area will take into consideration any advice from the department concerned with the Green Infrastructure study.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					Economic The site may provide future employment to the village but certainly the area, with the plan that is being put together concerning investment from the Far East. We are in consultation at the moment and can do no more until we have a positive result from yourselves, for this site.	See above	No changes required
	Mr A Larwood					Location Firstly may I say that Chedburgh has got a lot of interest right from the start simply because of its location on such a busy road. The site is perfect for the village to connect the centre with the main road and also the development that is being built on the old firework factory. It is very well suited for placement of a shop and other amenities because of the passing traffic trade, while allowing the residents to come to outlets from the centre of the village without using the busy road. We have a list of commercial outlets that are looking to consult further upon receipt of a positive Pen and Cane result for this village. The beauty of the room available with this site that it will enable for the building of a new Church mission being planned and developed this side of the main road. I already have a few well-known names within the Christian society from the USA. That will certainly get Chedburgh many blessings.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr A Larwood					Also the area possible for new sports fields with the link with the campus of a premier league football team Sewage We have been in touch with Anglia Water many times and as the firework factory site is so close to one end then it will not cause any problems building more dwellings. Press With this model comes an ideal opportunity for some very good press to be had. The regional press will love to run updates on how it is going with the complete involvement of the locals and them benefiting so much. Because of the Daily Telegraphs recent interest in parish council matters in Suffolk, as they as well as other publications and media have been in touch for a while now, we are also aware that they are very interested in doing follow up pieces. Should planning permission be granted this development is big enough to cater for all the required housing in Chedburgh until 2031.	See above	No changes required
	Mr A Larwood					We are only going forward with this proposal after extensive advice and research, after years of discussion with the highest bodies in both government and all other necessary departments. With much praise from all who have been kept updated, both here and abroad. Again, may I say that this has been planned with the hope that we will be able to work as a team, with all in St Edmundsbury borough council. We are all excited about this project and looking forward to our design and planning sessions with the residents and their total involvement. (See attached plan and statement)	See above	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15927	Paul Ingham				no	<p>REPORT AS LATE RESPONSE.</p> <p>I realise that the final date for comments has passed, but I wish to add an objection to the proposed development of 10 houses after 2026 in the light of flooding which occurred on Thursday 3rd May 2012. The field on which the houses are proposed was severely water logged and housing on this low point would be in peril of groundwater and surface flooding. The impact would be felt on neighbouring houses. Indeed, water ran off the field behind the proposed housing development and filled the ditches at the boundaries of the site, which overflowed, flooding the gardens, and some garages, of homes in Tudor Close - namely numbers 8, 6, 4 and 2</p> <p>This is an issue residents have raised with the parish and borough councils in the past and with the previous MP Richard Spring.</p> <p>The lack of maintenance of drainage ditches and pipes means that flooding of our properties, and the proposed site, would be MORE likely in the future as the field would be turned into an impermeable built environment.</p>	The policy requires that any application for development should demonstrate how surface water will be mitigated.	No changes required
	Paul Ingham					This is in addition to the point made in the previous consultation where it was made clear that Queen's Lane itself is unsuitable for the additional traffic which would be generated by such a development. This is due to both the narrowness of the lane and the proximity to a blind bend on which traffic all too frequently drives at excessive speed.	A transport assessment will be required as part of any planning application for development	Refer to the need for a transport statement in the supporting text.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV13a, but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough					Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Spead Eagle TL / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 34: Chedburgh (RV13)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 34a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?	Question 34b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15715	Martin Byford				no	Until there is better parking facilities off School Road for the primary school there should be no further housing development in Great Barton. Already School Road is a traffic 'no go' area twice a day and the footpath on the western side of School Road is cracking due to cars and commercial vehicles mounting the pavement to pass parked cars collecting children from school. The planned increase in school size must be accompanied by suitable parking facilities.	The provision of housing on this area will land will allow for the expansion of the school and associated parking. Access to the site will be from Mill Road.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no	In essence, the development plans for the land referred to as 'Compiègne Way' have a significant longer term impact on the village of Gt Barton and more so for the residents of Cattishall. Calling the proposed development Compiègne Way is in itself misleading as it does not clearly identify the land earmarked. Cattishall do not want to be 'swallowed up' into a Moreton Hall-like development and firmly should be kept within the Gt. Barton envelope. If Great Barton has to be developed at all - the land adjacent to the school seems to lend itself to this as it does not encroach on existing houses and butts onto Mill Road and A143 so further congestion maybe avoided. Parking at the school is a complete nightmare and with further development planned - this will have to be addressed as a matter of urgency/priority.	The strategic site off Compiègne Way is now identified as land north-east of Bury St Edmunds. A buffer zone will be provided between Cattishall and the site to avoid coalescence (See Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031). The provision of housing on this area will land will allow for the expansion of the school and associated parking. Access to the site will be from Mill Road.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisatio n company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15753	Graham Tee				no	It was with great dismay that I saw posters in School Road showing the proposal for 40 new houses to be built in part of the plot the Villagers call 'The Triangle' with unwanted vehicle access from the already greatly controversial School Road. This proposal ignores the Parish Council's plans and also ignores many of the comments made in the Rural Vision document 29. Great Barton Before any new houses are proposed a detailed plan should be created and discussed for the whole site of 'The Triangle' taking into account vehicle access from Mill Road (not School Road) and the allocation of the very precious land to the Schools, proposed Shops and other community facilities, car park for both Schools and Facilities and access to any new housing.	A development brief will be required for the whole site before a planning application can be approved.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road
RVR15757	R Hubbard				no	Dissappointed with the decision to build at the proposed site. School Road is already a bottle neck for traffic in the school area mainly caused by the amount of parked vehicles and being a narrow road. I am sure that if Great Barton needs development it should be in areas such as nearer to the Banbury crossroads where it would be close to the main A143 road and could include a roundabout at the crossroads making the area much safer by reducing motor accidents at what is a very dangerous junction. Two other more appropriate areas I feel is land again by the A143 on the left before coming into the village from Ixworth direction, also on unused meadow land opposite Hall Park on the right heading towards town. In my opinion if any of the sites I have mentioned were to be considered I'm sure that it would be cheaper and quicker and most of all less disturbing to build where there is already infrastructure to cope and less existing properties that will be impacted upon.	An opportunity and constraints study has identified the most appropriate locations for new development in Great Barton which are adjacent to the existing housing settlement boundary and close to services and facilities.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	However, There needs to be reference to the accompanying document which sets out a development proposal for the area bounded by School road, Mill road and the A143 which includes RV14a and RV14b. This area encompasses and compliments the themes upon which RV2031 is founded. (See supporting document)	The comments are noted	The policy has been amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the subject
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes	The Corporate Property Division of Suffolk County Council is willing to work with Great Barton Parish Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council to agree a Development Brief on the SCC owned site in the north east of the village adjoining the school, bounded by the A143, Mill Lane and School Lane. Such a Development Brief would define the long term mixed use development of this site, including an appropriate level of infrastructure, the future growth of Great Barton and address current issues around car parking and congestion on School Road.	The comments are noted and agreed with	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school.
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				<p>The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.</p> <p>The Society is keen to prevent coalescence of Great Barton with the expansion of the town. Expansion to the NE would accord with this aim. The provision of other facilities and uses should be based upon the aspirations of the community as evidenced by a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan. Measures have been put in place in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 document to ensure no coalescence between Great Barton and the town.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15861	Caroline Rogers				no	<p>This is a response to the above planning consultation proposal, which would stand to affect all residents of School Road, Great Barton (as well as those living in roads that lead directly onto School Road - namely School Lane, Lodge Close, Beech Park, Conyers Way and the roads leading off Conyers Way - Aspen Close, Chestnut Close, Maple Green and Downing Drive).</p> <p>I responded to the proposal of 2010 with a petition signed by many residents from the above mentioned roads; the proposal now goes further, adding school expansion and more housing.</p> <p>It's worth repeating the very serious points raised in my letter of 2010, that If there were to be any housing in the proposed area, as well as expansion of the school - and should access to that housing be considered (for access/egress) leading onto School Road it would bring much greater chaos and carry the threat of increased accidents in an already very over congested road - most especially at the height of school arrival/collection times.</p>	The provision of housing on this area will land will allow for the expansion of the school and associated parking. Access to the site will be from Mill Road.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Caroline Rogers					<p>The fact that this proposal has now seen an increase in housing numbers and expansion of the school means that there is an even greater reason for the council to NOT consider any road access into School Road for this proposal. The road gets full to capacity and totally jammed twice daily every day in term time, year in year out (see photos). Add traffic from 40 houses and an even bigger school into the mix and it would be simply unthinkable to even consider any access into School Road.</p> <p>While this proposal shows two small road leading into a development/school area, it offers no solution to the over crowding that the road experiences already - and with the creation of extra traffic would serve to worsen that overcrowding. The message is very clear - there should be NO access considered/given into School Road.</p>	Agree with constraints of School Road to accommodate additional traffic.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road
	Caroline Rogers					<p>Residents of School Road and its tributaries have been affected for a long time by the ever increasing amounts of traffic that uses the road daily during term time for school drop off and collection. In 2009 a new facility built next to the school, Great Barton Pathways, a pre-school for under fives opened, which now sees use as an Extended Hours Care facility and Holiday Club for out of school activities. This has increased general usage of School Road as a free-for-all car parking facility. Verges, front lawns and driveways are frequently driven over, not only by cars, but also by large school coaches/buses, which often have to drive with two wheels well up onto the pavement (which exists on only one side of the road from School Lane up to Mill Road) to circumnavigate the long blockage of cars and 4x4s which occupy, at times, almost the whole length of the road.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Caroline Rogers					This already poses a threat to those parents/children who live close enough get to school on foot, and who walk in family groups, often with younger children in buggies/push chairs, having to take every caution and vigilance for their own safety. Many parents have seen their children coming close to being clipped/knocked down. Added to this, any other traffic using the road at these already very busy times, including commercial vehicles - delivery vans etc, also employ the same tactic of driving right up on the pavement - hardly an ideal scenario at the best of times.	See above	See above
	Caroline Rogers					<p>Parking by parents collecting from school currently regularly extends right up to Conyers Way " and beyond that from Conyers Way to Mill Road the road narrows, with only a very small width of pavement on one side. At times some residents have found their driveways blocked by inconsiderate parents who claim they cannot find anywhere else to park other than across someone else's driveway.</p> <p>This is already a highly unacceptable situation. If this were added to by any other regular amount of traffic, not only would the threat of potential hazards increase, including the lives of young school children, but it would create an intolerable growth in congestion.</p> <p>The structure of the area simply cannot and would not be able to cope, and as such makes this proposal for housing access completely untenable.</p> <p>These considerations should be absolutely paramount in any council discussions.</p> <p>(See attached photos and copy of 2010 petition)</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15904	Mr Jean Cripps					As there is no money or plans for new roads or making existing roads safer for pedestrians or cyclists, for instance children or the elderly able to use roads safely why bring more residents and homes for such here.	Agree with constraints of School Road to accommodate additional traffic. The site will be accessed off Mill Road	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no	Great Barton needs to be preserved as a village.	Great Barton is a Local Service Centre and further growth will be in accordance with this status and the villages environmental and infrastructure capacity.	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				no	<p>1. Current congestion - at school opening and closing times School Road is almost impassable. Child safety is being threatened by the need for large vehicles (such as coaches) to mount the pavement to pass parked cars. A 40 house development would make congestion significantly worse.</p> <p>2. Air Quality - A recent report found that the air quality on The Street, Great Barton was poor. This was particularly so around the School Road junction. With a potential further 60 children at the primary school and this proposed development all using School Road, air quality can only deteriorate.</p> <p>3. School expansion - the movement from a three tier to a two tier school system has proposed that the primary school be extended to accept a further two school years. up to 60 further children.</p>	Agree with constraints of School Road to accommodate additional traffic. The air quality issues are recognised and additional policy text is added to deal with issues.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road. Additional policy text added about requiring development to respond to noise, air quality and congestion issues.
	A Burnell					The policy, whilst making reference to this, does not adequately address how the additional traffic will be managed. School Road cannot accommodate the current traffic, therefore any development needs to ensure that sufficient parking is incorporated to allow parents of pre-teen children can drop off safely. This will require permanent off street space.	Agree with constraints of School Road to accommodate additional traffic.	Amend policy to state access to the site will be from Mill Road.
RVR15962	Mr and Mrs C Stenderup				no	We do not agree with the plan for open access land/country park in your developer preferred option. This would involve further amenities (toilets/visitor centre etc). The village of Great Barton would benefit from the farmland and countryside already in place. A country park would not be a 'buffer zone' between the village and the new development.	These issues have been considered in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 document.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves				yes	Under RV31, Q35, 36 and 37, we generally support Draft Policy RV14 and the Great Barton Parish Council's additional proposal to make more extensive long-term strategic plans for 'The Triangle' boundaries by the A143, Mill Road and School Road. The village will benefit from the further development of an already excellent school facility and a 'community centre', which might include a store / post office, health facility and other amenities would be welcome. Recognising the need for generational balance across the community, we note the inclusion of affordable homes, but would advocate the inclusion of suitable accommodation for retired and elderly people as well.	The support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
		This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The description of consultee concerns on Great Barton has noted congestion issues in Great Barton, which have resulted in the imposition of an air quality management area. The centre of Great Barton has also been identified as a location for action/mitigation in the National Noise Mapping programme. The county council would therefore support the borough council in any efforts to alleviate these issues, such as the Policy CS11 of the Core strategy, which requires that growth to the north east of Bury St Edmunds facilitates the provision of a bypass for Great Barton. On that basis, policy RV14 might be modified to recognise those issues and support any proposed solutions, making reference to the need for development to respect and respond appropriately to congestion, air quality and noise management issues in Great Barton. This would be in line with paragraphs 109 and 124 of the NPPF.	Agree with proposed additions to policy	Amend policy to make reference to congestion, air quality and noise issues.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV14a) and RV14b), but they will each require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Due to the schools organisation review, it is not possible to judge what the school capacity issues would be over the plan period. The proposed 40 dwellings would generate an additional 10 pupils over the plan period. As noted in paragraph 29.22, potential development at this location could stifle growth of the school site to deal with extra capacity. We note that comments from county council 'Resources' have been included in the summary of statutory consultee comments. The county council suggests that comments such as these, where the county council is acting as a landowner and not a service delivery body (as is the case with education and transport), are not included in documents such as these in future, as they potentially create a confusing picture for the public. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage. Note comments about school capacity and inclusion of statutory consultee comments.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no	This is a response to the above planning consultation proposal, which would stand to affect all residents of School Road, Great Barton, as well as those living in roads that lead directly onto School Road namely School Lane, Lodge Close, Beech Park, Conyers Way and the roads leading off Conyers Way, Aspen Close, Chestnut Close, Maple Green and Downing Drive. Considering this, it seems very disappointing that the council only saw fit to send copies of the intended plans to just two households in the whole of School Road. Legally sticking within the council guidelines of only going to properties with bordering boundaries, this proposal carries a far more serious threat and as such has much wider implications than just on those whose houses are in closest proximity.	The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Brindley					<p>If there were to be any housing in the proposed area - and should access to that housing be considered (for access/egress) leading onto School Road - it would create real chaos and carry the threat of increased accidents in an already very over congested road most especially at the height of school arrival/collection times.</p> <p>Residents of School Road have been affected for a long time by the ever increasing amounts of traffic that uses the road daily during term time for school drop off and collection. Last year a new facility built next to the school, Great Barton Pathways, a pre-school for under fives opened, which now sees use as an Extended Hours Care facility and Holiday Club for out of school activities. This, needless to say, has increased general usage of School Road as a free-for-all car parking facility.</p>	Access will be from Mill Road and the needs of the school are recognised	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school.
	Peter Brindley					<p>Verges, front lawns and driveways are frequently driven over, not only by cars, but also by large school coaches/buses, which often have to drive with two wheels well up onto the pavement (which exists on only one side of the road from School Lane up to Mill Road) to circumnavigate the long blockage of cars and 4x4s which occupy, at times, almost the whole length of the road. This already poses a threat to those parents/children who live close enough get to school on foot, and who walk in family groups, often with younger children in buggies/push chairs, having to take every caution and vigilance for their own safety. Many parents have seen their children coming close to being clipped/knocked down. Added to this, any other traffic using the road at these already very busy times, including commercial vehicles delivery vans etc, also employ the same tactic of driving right up on the pavement a hardly ideal scenario at the best of times.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Brindley					<p>Parking by parents collecting from school currently regularly extends right up to Conyers Way and beyond that from Conyers Way to Mill Road the road narrows, with only a very small width of pavement on one side. At times some residents have found their driveways blocked by inconsiderate parents who claim they cannot find anywhere else to park other than across someone else's driveway. This is already a highly unacceptable situation. If this were added to by any other regular amount of traffic, not only would the threat of potential hazards increase, including the lives of young school children, but it would create an intolerable growth in totally unnecessary congestion. Quite alarmingly, concerned neighbours who visited borough offices to view the plans were told by someone at the council in somewhat cavalier fashion: Oh don't worry, we'll put double yellow lines on the lower part of School Road so no one will be able to park there.</p>	See above	See above
	Peter Brindley					<p>This would simply shunt the problem further afield causing yet more problems; School Lane would see increased parking this is a cul-de-sac lane with no pavement whatever and is used by many parents who walk their children through from the Conyers Way estate. The structure of the area simply cannot and would not be able to cope, and as such makes any proposal for housing and access completely untenable.</p> <p>On top of this, looking further to the future, as/when middle schools in the area close, plans are in place to add two extra classes to Great Barton CE VC Primary School, meaning an extra 60 children being delivered/collected from school daily.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Peter Brindley					Residents are asked to consider alternative sites to suggest there was, a while ago, a proposal for a large block of housing off Livermere Road, which has much better access into Bury St Edmunds, as Fornham Road and the A134 are double options. As such, it was deemed unsuitable for such a big amount of housing, however, should a tasteful development of a much smaller amount of housing be planned there this would be a far more preferable option to anything on School Road, and disrupt far less lives and safety of youngsters. These considerations should be absolutely paramount in any council discussions.	See above	See above
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21286E	Chris Jackson				no	THE SCHOOL ROAD/ A143 JUNCTION IS VERY BUSY AT PRESENT. TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS HAVE OCCURRED AT THIS JUNCTION IN THE PAST. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT ALONG THIS ROAD WOULD LEAD TO AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC USING THIS JUNCTION. THE OTHER ACCESS TO SCHOOL ROAD VIA MILL ROAD IS ALREADY SUBJECT TO HIGH LEVELS OF SPEEDING TRAFFIC.	Access will be from Mill Road and the needs of the school are recognised	Policy amended to state access to the site will be from Mill Road
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	There must be a cohesive plan to alleviate the nightmare of dropping of and collecting times from the school. School Road is a night mare for residents and parents at the school at this time. Is there enough room for the primary school to accommodate two more years with the school re-organisation ?	There is sufficient space on the school site on to accommodate additional two year groups	The policy has been amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made eg Otterwill Road Bridge	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no	A143 traffic implications School road traffic implications proposed development does not fit in with overall development of the area	The school traffic issues are recognised and access to the site will be from Mill Road	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 35: Great Barton (RV14)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 35a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?	Question 35b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				yes	Just the issue of safe access into and out of the new site, and parking space at the school.	The school traffic issues are recognised and access to the site will be from Mill Road	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				no	Gt Barton needs a larger development to meet the aspirations of the parishioners	The site will provide for the long term growth of Great Barton	See policy changes
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no	Policy RV14 gives a very narrow view of the required improvements in a community the size of Great Barton (housing, education and footpaths). Great Barton requires additional retail, health and community facilities, e.g. allotments. The allocation of this site for housing only is insufficient. I support the efforts of the Parish Council to create a "vision" for the development of this area, building on the community needs identified in the Parish Plan of 2009.	Great Barton is a Local Service Centre and further growth will be in accordance with this status and the villages environmental and infrastructure capacity. The site as a whole will require a development brief to identify long term uses and delivery of services and facilities as well as housing.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 36: Great Barton north east growth

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to the north-east of Great Barton?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15715	Martin Byford				<p>no</p> <p>Only if the traffic problems mentioned in qu 35 are solved together with improved junctions at the north and south ends of School Road. AN access road built further east along Mill Road would solve these issues.</p> <p>Whatever happens to this area it will not bacome a village centre. The village is so spread out from Thurston Road to the Cattishall rail crossing that people will travel to Bury for most facilities. The village hall and sports ground/play area are the other side of the very busy A143. I don't see any retail establishments such a a general store/post office being able to survive in the current world of internet shopping and big supermarkets in the nearby Bury.</p> <p>The proposal for 40 new houses and increased school size proposed in the two stages would gain my support if the access to the new houses and school were from a new road off Mill Road. There must be suitable parking at the school to alleviate the current problems being experienced in School Road.</p>	The comments are noted and the policy has been amended to allow access from Mill Road	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking .
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15753	Graham Tee				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 36: Great Barton north east growth

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to to the north-east of Great Barton?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15904	Mr Jean Cripps				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 36: Great Barton north east growth

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to to the north-east of Great Barton?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				No - with a proposed 1250 house development at Catishall, it would seem more appropriate to add a further 40 houses to this development where sufficient planning of the infrastructure can take place, rather than putting pressure on already strained existing villages.	Great Barton is a Local Service Centre and further growth will be in accordance with this status and the villages environmental and infrastructure capacity. The site as a whole will require a development brief to identify long term uses and delivery of services and facilities as well as housing.	No changes required
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 36: Great Barton north east growth

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to the north-east of Great Barton?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 36: Great Barton north east growth

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 36a - Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to to the north-east of Great Barton?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				no	No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jепtepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				yes	This support is welcomed	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				Doctor's surgery New Post Office in heart of village so majority of villagers do not have to cross busy road Coffee House Library	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15753	Graham Tee				<p>For a number of years the Parish Council and Great Barton Residents have been considering the future development of our Village, and this plot of land called 'The Triangle'. The Triangle gives Great Barton a Unique chance of creating a Village Hub which has not existed before. This hub must have safe spokes to the other key units - the Petrol Station, Village Hall, Free Church, Church Institute, Primary School and local housing in the way of foot and cycle paths.</p> <p>The Hub, with vehicle access from Mill Road, should have adequate parking to facilitate the Schools and other facilities such as Post Office, Convenience Store, Pub, Health Centre, Mobile Library, Mobile Vegetable, Fish, Meat, Ready Meals Vans, Mobile Vet, Recycle Centre, Local monthly Market and of course some new houses.</p>	<p>The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Graham Tee				<p>The Rural Vision document 29.1 states that Great Barton has 'several shops' and 'Pubs', this is unfortunately not the case. There is no Village Pub, The Bunbury is situated on the very edge of the Village and not considered by most villagers to be part of Great Barton. The Post Office is in the wrong place and is doomed unless something is done about the nightmare A143 and without the Petrol Station we would not have any shops.</p> <p>'The Triangle' is the best place to plan and develop to create a heart for Great Barton and should include as many facilities for the community as possible, such as, Post Office, Pub, Convenience Store, mobile Library, mobile shops, Health Centre, Car Park for Schools and Shops, Vehicle access from Mill Road, linkage footpaths to rest of Village including the Petrol Station, Village Hall and recreation ground with a pedestrian crossing over the A143 (just North of the Petrol Station almost opposite Cox Lane)</p>	<p>The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			See supporting document: In summary: A development which could achieve aspirations from the Parish Plan and subsequent consultations with parishioners to supply the following amenities and services; The proposal would also alleviate congestion and safety concerns from school road and with an approved traffic management system for the access/egress off Mill road would reduce the potential to speeding when proceeding from the east on B1106.	The content of the supporting documents is noted	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			The Corporate Property Division of Suffolk County Council is willing to work with Great Barton Parish Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council to agree a Development Brief on the SCC owned site in the north east of the village adjoining the school, bounded by the A143, Mill Lane and School Lane. Such a Development Brief would define the long term mixed use development of this site, including an appropriate level of infrastructure, the future growth of Great Barton and address current issues around car parking and congestion on School Road.	The Council welcomes the support	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15904	Mr Jean Cripps				Bury St Edmunds cannot cope with a surge of new people into this area. I moved here from London 1966. So far I see little change of any facilities except those provided by residents themselves.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy has been amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses.
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				No opinion	Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				Nothing	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				Retail	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				There is plenty of open land in Barton not used for agriculture, and as long as it does not reduce an individuals quality of life.	Comments are noted	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15924	A Burnell				Community woodland and allotments	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves				Under RV31, Q35, 36 and 37, we generally support Draft Policy RV14 and the Great Barton Parish Council's additional proposal to make more extensive long-term strategic plans for 'The Triangle' boundaries by the A143, Mill Road and School Road. The village will benefit from the further development of an already excellent school facility and a 'community centre', which might include a store / post office, health facility and other amenities would be welcome. Recognising the need for generational balance across the community, we note the inclusion of affordable homes, but would advocate the inclusion of suitable accommodation for retired and elderly people as well.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.				See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council			The county council would hope to see appropriate levels of community, health, education, leisure, employment and retail facilities commensurate with the scale of growth and the size of the settlement.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				No development thank you	Great Barton is a Local Service Centre and further growth will be in accordance with this status and the villages environmental and infrastructure capacity.	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				Resiting of post office/shop. Provision for small doctors surgery. Community facilities already exist which would be adequate for proposed extra housing units. Urgent need for traffic improvements to School Road See no reason why 7.5b should not proceed at same time as 7.5a	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Wools				Wild life park for people to walk and see wild life.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			Allotments are vital. If there is a need for retail then this would be an obvious place to place it, but the issues of parking on School Road has to be addressed. I do not see a need for business/commercial space.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				Retail ,Doctors, New Post Office etc as Great Barton, will without these it will become a ghost village with the NEW LOWER BARTON VILLAGE (Berkeley) going up with the latest School Shops and other less than 200 yards down the A143	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				Community Woodland Allotments Footpaths Open public spaces	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				New shops, Post Office, and doctor's surgery. May be a day centre too for the elderly.	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.
RVR21768E	Philip Reeve				See the proposed development of the triangle site NE of Great Barton to create a hub and not have Gt Barton become a dormitory	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 37: Great Barton use of land

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 37a - As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small and locally focused retail outlet, ideally an EoE Co-operative Society store or similar, not a small branch of one of the major supermarket chains - An improved and re-located village post office, possibly in partnership with another facility (ret 	The uses on the site will be determined through the production of a development brief for the whole site. This will be subject to public consultation.	The policy will be amended to make it clear that a development brief needs to be prepared for the whole triangle of land indicating future uses, access from Mill Road and allowing for the expansion of the school and associated parking.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15834	Molly Hawkins	Little Thurlow Parish Council			no	<p>Little Thurlow Parish Council is very concerned about any possible increased traffic through the village when the proposed new houses are built in and around Haverhill.</p> <p>In answer to Question 38, although Little Thurlow Parish Council would not advocate new build on a large scale, it does feel that there is a problem with the lack of provision of low cost housing for purchase or rental in the village. Ideally it would like to see a more permanent population locally with "affordable" houses for sale and to let for those with local connections. Little Thurlow does have an ageing population which will lead to a less vibrant community in the long term without a younger influx. The offspring of both homeowners and tenants are unable in the main to find affordable accommodation in the village should they wish.</p>	A small site is included for development of 5 dwellings in the final version of the Rural Vision document. The wish for affordable housing is recognised.	Policy amended to include site for 5 dwellings.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15849	Mr Brian Barrow	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd		The Thurlow Estate	no	The Thurlow Estate do not wish to promote substantial residential development within these villages, but do consider limited development is appropriate in the villages to support objectives 4 and 8 and wish to resubmit Goldings Farm as shown on the attached extract (coloured yellow). The site was formerly assessed by your Authority and considered suitable, although Thurlow Estate withdrew this when there was a general local objection to other sites they had suggested. However, in only promoting this site, and in not seeking to promote any other site outside the current development boundary, the Estate agrees with the council's previous assessment that Goldings Farm 'fits' well within the development boundary and contains redundant buildings and would therefore benefit from redevelopment.	A small site is included for development of 5 dwellings in the final version of the Rural Vision document. The wish for affordable housing is recognised.	Policy amended to include site for 5 dwellings.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr Brian Barrow	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd		The Thurlow Estate		<p>An area of woodland (coloured blue on the plan) has been included within recreational open space. The woodland does not form any part of the playing fields/recreation use and should not be allocated as such.</p> <p>The Estate also consider that any sites promoted for employment use, assuming that they are appropriate in design, scale and location, should be encouraged and supported, so as to provide sustainable employment opportunities to residents.</p>	Agree that the woodland is not part of recreational open space and that this should be amended on the plans	The Proposals Map has been amended to delete the area of woodland as recreational open space
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The decision not to allocate further sites in Thurlow should be based upon the aspirations of the community as evidenced by a Neighbourhood Plan.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan. A small site is included for development of 5 dwellings in the final version of the Rural Vision document	Policy amended to include site for 5 dwellings.
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment on this issue at this time.	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 38a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2013?	Question 38b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15665	Mr and Mrs C. Plumb					(Comment by post summarised) We bought our house in 1978 in Hambrook Close as it was in a quiet cul-de-sac with no through traffic. If they open up the end of Hambrook Close onto the new proposed site there will be a lot more traffic and noise. I know all the residents feel the same and one family has moved already. We would have no objection to houses being built if they did not open up the end of the close and had their own entrance coming out onto Stanningfield Road. This could be done as the farmer already has an entrance onto Stanningfield Road. There is also an issue of water gathering at the bottom of Hambrook Close.	The small number of dwellings proposed will not significantly increase the traffic flow through Hambrook Close. Some dwellings could be accessed directly from Stanningfield Road	The Policy has been amended so that whilst primary access will be from Hambrook Close some dwellings could be accessed from Stanningfield Road
RVR15670	Dick Kirby				no	I refer to the 'proposed' development at site 7.7a (Tutelina Rise, Great Whelnetham) which was shown at page 91 of the Local Development Framework email, received on 29 February 2012 where it was stated that any development would only be permitted after the phasing date shown 2011-2021. The following day, site 7.7a was speedily changed to site RV15a, with development commencing between those dates. This demonstrates, if any further illustration were needed, of the underhandedness of St. Edmundsbury Council in their frantic desire to change the goalposts in order to suit themselves, not the population whom they are supposed to serve.	The reference numbering of site allocations in documents changes between drafts of the documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dick Kirby					It is clear that since 12 April 2010, when notification was announced by the council of the proposed development of the land between Hambrook Close and Fenton's Farm, this site was what they wanted, to the exclusion of any other, to build premises, including 'affordable housing' on the site. Although this was described as being part of a 'consultation process', this did not appear to be the case as far as the owner of Fenton's Farm was concerned who had already started planting bushes and then erecting fences to separate his premises from the site. It appeared that the farm's owner was of the opinion that development on that site was a foregone conclusion.	No site allocation is guaranteed until a plan is adopted, which in the case of the Rural Vision document will be in late 2014.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dick Kirby					<p>It was made abundantly clear to the council that the residents of Hambrook Close were opposed to this development in a carefully structured document which set out their opposition to the scheme, submitted to the council on 31 May 2010. One year later, on 18 May 2011, a 'drop-in' session was held at the Great Whelnetham Community Centre in respect of this proposal. In fact, the purpose of this meeting was to fatuously enquire if the residents had changed their minds. And now, almost a year after that, the council are still asking for comments regarding this development.</p> <p>In brief, the comments are these: no-one in Hambrook Close wants this development to commence, nor do they want access to the site via Hambrook Close. They do not want the increase in vehicular traffic which will inevitably follow, nor the very real prospect of traffic accidents and congestion. Prices of property in this vicinity have slumped and those who wish to sell their properties are unable to do so, because of the threat of this development.</p>	The allocation of the site is based on the environmental and infrastructure capacity of the village and it's status as a Local Service Centre.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Dick Kirby					The number of proposed houses would not be in keeping with the existing properties. The drains cannot cope with surface water now, let alone the increase that development would bring, there is the loss of agricultural land and the present capacity at the local primary school is full. But why is it necessary to repeat some these facts when the council are already fully aware of the entirety of the objections? The situation as far as the residents of Hambrook Close are concerned is simply not going to change. There may be further periods of what is laughingly called 'public consultation' but I am just as certain that the council is going to attempt to ride rough-shod over any and all objections which will be made.	The Local Plans system requires a number of rounds of public consultation and will take into account any objections which would fundamentally affect the delivery of the site.	No changes required
	Dick Kirby					However, rather than answer any further questions to which the council already know the answers, I would wish to ask the council a question to which I do not know the answer. I wish to know details of any proposed deals which may already have been made between them and property developers in respect of this site - and when precisely they were drawn up.	See above	no changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15717	Gisela Oram				no	<p>The plot of land off Tutelina Rise has already been well prepared by the owner of Fenton Farm, so that leaves little doubt that there will be some change.</p> <p>Erecting 10 dwellings is excessive for the amount of land, the style of building surrounding the plot and the traffic flow. Eight would be much more in line with the original plans (from around 1970) and giving a more likely bland with spacing and style of building with the rest of Hambrook Close.</p> <p>I am told that Hambrook Close will remain a cul-de-sac. With this in mind I would suggest that the properties built facing Stanningfield Road have their own driveways/vehicle access. as do the adjoining existing bungalows there.</p> <p>When allowing a considerable amount of extra vehicles to use the t-junction between Hambrook Close and Stanningfield Road (right in front of my property!), I would like to suggest that there should be parking restrictions near that junction.</p>	The small number of dwellings proposed will not significantly increase the traffic flow through Hambrook Close. Some dwellings could be accessed directly from Stanningfield Road	The Policy has been amended so that whilst primary access will be from Hambrook Close some dwellings could be accessed from Stanningfield Road
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper					No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15797	Christine Peck	Great Whelnetham Parish Council			no	<p>The Parish Council believes that there is a need for affordable housing in Great Whelnetham. It is not clear whether this proposal is designed to meet that need. We understand that there is considerable opposition to the scheme from residents in Hambrook Close.</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that you should take into account the opportunity to develop land adjacent to Erskine Lodge (proposal already submitted to you). The owner of that site has told us that it would be willing to build 21 affordable dwellings, to be made available to people with proven local needs. It has also told us that it would be willing to designate as public open space any part of the site that is not suitable for development (e.g. that part which immediately adjoins the stream). We believe that such a designation would be welcomed in the village. We believe this site should be considered for development in the short term.</p> <p>Your plan should not discount, or ignore, the opportunity to develop this site, for the benefit of the village.</p>	The need for affordable housing is recognised and an additional site is allocated in the Rural Vision document for affordable homes at Erskine Lodge to meet this need.	Site allocated at Erskine Lodge for affordable homes.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15801	Max Milburn	MLT Architects	Peter Thurlo w	Abbeygate Properties Ltd		<p>This submission is made in further response to Q39 with reference to Policy RV15 contained within the Rural Vision 31 Consultation Document</p> <p>We make no comment upon the Council's preference to develop a site south of Tutelina Rise but we disagree with the rejection from consideration of the site adjacent to Erskine Lodge where the owner/developer is in a unique position to immediately provide a much needed mix of affordable accommodation. Part of the site is identified as SS11/06 in the Consultation Document</p> <p>The accompanying plans 6440-002A & SK03 indicate a preferred form of development which could be of considerable benefit to the local community In essence it comprises the provision of 6 No lettable family dwellings to be made available on a turn-key basis to a registered housing association at a price where the land element is at nil cost.</p> <p>The further construction of 4 No three bed houses, 5 No two bed houses and 2 No two bed bungalows would be offered for sale at a discount of 20% to purchasers with proven local needs</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Max Milburn	MLT Architects	Peter Thurlow	Abbeygate Properties Ltd		The remaining 4 No plots which complete the mixed development will be made available at competitive market valuations for the individual construction of dwellings for self build occupation The part of the site which falls within the designated flood plain would be landscaped and made available to the local Parish Council for public use The developer will factor in the construction of roads and other basic infrastructure costs and consequently any out turn profit is likely to be minimal. This is possible only because the owner/developer has held the land for several decades at an historically low value There is a cordon sanitaire relating to the close proximity of the existing sewage treatment works and the owner/developer is in consultation with Anglian Water to seek ways in which contribution can be made to any necessary upgrading. Development is also constrained by an existing pumped main which traverses the site and the owner/developer is also aware of the potential impact of the site's location in the Sicklesmere Conservation Area	See above	See above
	Max Milburn	MLT Architects	Peter Thurlow	Abbeygate Properties Ltd		But none of these constraints seem sufficient to outweigh the immediate benefits that this development proposal can provide for the local community. This is clearly recognised by the Parish Council who appear to be very supportive. (See attached plans)	See above	See above
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15848	Timothy Phillips				no	WE ARE STRONGLY OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSAL BY THE COUNCIL TO USE THE ABOVE LAND AS A PREFERRED OPTION FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE DRAFT RURAL VISION 2031. THE REASONS BEING THAT HAMBROOK CLOSE IS AN EXCLUSIVE CUL-DE-SAC WHICH HAS ALWAYS ATTRACTED HIGHER PROPERTY PRICES BECAUSE IT IS QUIET AND A SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR CHILDREN TO GROW UP IN. THIS IS THE REASON WE PURCHASED OUR PROPERTY BACK IN 1984 HAVING TWO YOUNG SONS AT THE TIME AND HAVE LIVED HERE EVER SINCE. IF THE DEVELOPMENT WERE TO GO AHEAD WE BELIEVE THE PLAN IS TO ALLOW ACCESS ONTO THE STANNINGFIELD ROAD THROUGH OUR HAMBROOK CLOSE BY OPENING UP	The small number of dwellings proposed will not significantly increase the traffic flow through Hambrook Close. Some dwellings could be accessed directly from Stanningfield Road	The Policy has been amended so that whilst primary access will be from Hambrook Close some dwellings could be accessed from Stanningfield Road
	Timothy Phillips					THE FENCE WHICH SEPARATES US FROM THE FARMERS LAND. THIS WOULD BE TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE AS IT WOULD DEVALUE OUR PROPERTIES SUBSTANTIALLY (WE HAVE BEEN INFORMED BY ONE ESTATE AGENT (£20,000 OR MORE) ALSO HAMBROOK CLOSE COULD NOT SUSTAIN THE EXTRA TRAFFIC INCURRED DURING DEVELOPMENT I.E. HEAVY LORRIES ETC. PLUS THE POSSIBILITY OF 20 OR MORE VANS+ CARS BELONGING TO THE NEW OCCUPANTS.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Timothy Phillips					IF GOD FORBID IT DOES GO AHEAD THE ACCESS SHOULD BE FROM FENTON'S FARM DIRECTLY ONTO STANNINGFIELD ROAD AND LEAVE US ALONE. ANOTHER IMPORTANT POINT IS THAT THE VILLAGE CANNOT COPE WITH EXTRA HOUSES ESPECIALLY AS FAR AS THE LOCAL SCHOOL IS CONCERNED. IT IS FULL TO CAPACITY AND THE PARKING THERE IN THE MORNINGS AND AFTERNOONS IS HIGHLY DANGEROUS WITH AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN. ALSO DURING THESE TIMES YOU CANNOT EVEN PARK NEAR TO THE LOCAL CHURCH TO TEND TO THE GRAVES. IN CONCLUSION THE CONGESTION IN HAMBROOK CLOSE HAS INCREASED DRAMATICALLY OVER THE YEARS WE HAVE BEEN HERE. CARS AND VANS PARKING ON THE ROAD AND PAVEMENTS. ANY FURTHER TRAFFIC WOULD BE A REAL BURDEN AND COMPLETELY UNSAFE + DANGEROUS.	See above	See above
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV15a), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. It is difficult to say what capacity issues will be presented at the local school, given that it is yet to be consulted on in the schools organisation review. However, it is already over capacity and so any addition pupils will probably result in the need for developer contributions to provide additional capacity. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	The comments are noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A134 at SouthGate Green / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made with this and the 1250 + being built directly on this road	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (RV15)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 39a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little	Question 39b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15673	Rita and Mike Baker				no	<p>We would like to submit our comments re the above development proposal for Hopton village.</p> <p>We note that the site is proposed for development in the Medium Term (after 2021), and although we would prefer not to have development on the back of our garden at all, we understand that it will probably go ahead. We have very elderly neighbours who are very upset about the the proposals and the change of what, at the moment, is a wonderful view from the rear of their properties, but they would gain some comfort, as would we, in knowing that the development definitely will not start until after 2021, as proposed. Can you confirm that this date will not change, as after attending our Parish Council meeting on 12th March, a couple of our Parish Councillors asked the Chairman to write to the Council to have the development brought forward to the short term, although why they are in such a rush, is not clear.</p>	The phasing date for the delivery of the site has been removed to allow it to be brought forward at any time within the plan period	Policy amended to remove phasing date
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15692	G. Clark					With the benefit of an illustration of the distribution of possible uses I can see the logic in the proposals given the context and character of the site including views in and out. I remain concerned at the "indicated capacity" of the density for the area which suggests something more than a single depth development fronting Jury Road. In my opinion this runs the risk of urbanising the southern approach into the village. Obviously after all this, success or failure also depends on the quality and detailing of the design.	A concept statement and masterplan will be required for the site which will be subject to further consultation.	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper					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).	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				<p>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).</p> <p>Primary school capacity in Hopton should be sufficient to cope with the proposed level of development. We appreciate the efforts made by the borough council to ensure that there is the potential to expand the school site, and all parties should work to ensure that opportunities for sharing of school playing field facilities' with the community are maximised.</p> <p>Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid, and we would suggest that it may be appropriate for policy RV16 to make specific reference to the need to provide suitable pedestrian links between this site and the centre of the village.</p>	The comments are noted. The need for footpath links to the village centre is recognised and will be referenced in the policy text.	Reference to footpath and cycle way access to the village centre has been made in the policy
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				<p>(a) We note that the Rural Vision 2031 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has recommended additional wording for policy RV! ^ (a) in order to seek to minimise any adverse effects on the Waveney-Little Ouse Valley Fens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which could occur from increased recreational pressure and increased sewage and surface water resulting from the proposed development. These amendments do not appear in the Preferred Options document and we request that they are included within the final version of the document.</p>	The recommended policy changes in the Preferred Options HRA have been made to the policy	The recommende d policy changes in the Preferred Options HRA have been made to the policy

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			no	The time period for development in Hopton is proposed as "Medium" viz: 2021. The issue of improved provision for school recreation facilities already needs addressing and concerns already exist about whether the medical centre will continue beyond the next three years. These two issues alone indicate the need for a more immediate policy. Also the potential life of the existing village hall building is questionable for anything more than the short term.	The phasing date for the delivery of the site has been removed to allow it to be brought forward at any time within the plan period	Policy amended to remove phasing date
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion	Where is the Infrastructural change for the A143 at Great Barton / Bury St Edmunds to cope with extra density of traffic being made eg Otterwill Road Bridge For all the Rural Vision build along the A143	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no	A143 traffic implications	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 40: Hopton (RV16)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisati on company	Question 40a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?	Question 40b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21677E	Mark Filler				no	Proposal is contrary to statement that housing should be based on local need. Recent housing needs survey identified requirement for only 4 to 6 houses in the village, not 25. The current proposal is excessively large and will have a negative impact on the context and character of the village. No proper account has been taken of the likely availability of employment opportunities in the local area and which will necessitate travel to main the areas of employment such as Norwich, Ipswich and Cambridge. A volunteer bus service to Bury St Edmunds will be inadequate.	The Core Strategy identified the village as a Local Service Centre which can take further small scale growth. The allocation has been made in accordance with the identified opportunities and constraints in the village.	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 41: Hundon

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?	Question 41b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 41: Hundon**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?	Question 41b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 41: Hundon**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?	Question 41b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 41: Hundon**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?	Question 41b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council welcomes the acknowledgement that Site 7.9a is required for school playing field use.	See above	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Noted	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 41: Hundon**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 41a - Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?	Question 41b - If not, please set out your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 42: Ingham (RV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with the draft policy on RV17 on Ingham?	Question 42b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 42: Ingham (RV17)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with the draft policy on RV17 on Ingham?	Question 42b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 42: Ingham (RV17)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with the draft policy on RV17 on Ingham?	Question 42b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				Existing school capacity should be sufficient to cope with this level of growth at Ingham. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	See above The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 42: Ingham (RV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with the draft policy on RV17 on Ingham?	Question 42b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough					Traffic on the A134 from this Major Road with the 6000 homes going up in Thetford and 500 in Fornham.1250 Gt Barton = GRID LOCK at Thetford Rd / Fornham Rd Bury St Edmunds.Action NOW... NOT LATER Action Required	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 42: Ingham (RV17)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 42a - Do you agree with the draft policy on RV17 on Ingham?	Question 42b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15666	Kay Fisher	MacRae Farms Ltd			yes	(Summarised) Risby is an ideal village to be promoted as a Local Service Centre, being adjacent to the A14 with easy access and good reach of major Suffolk towns and Cambridge. Attractive and historic village with opportunities for 'backfill' residential areas which would not compromise the ambience of the village or alter significant views. Two schools and employment opportunities within walking distance. Two pubs and potential for a village shop. Proposal for residential is set back from the street so no infringement on existing buildings or the adjacent conservation area. A sensitive development here would enhance the area and the increased population would help maintain lifeblood of village community. Careful landscaping would increase the diversity of plant population away from monoculture of agriculture. The modest removal of 1.4ha of land from farming operation could be accommodated elsewhere on the holding and due to the crop rotation of sugar beet and two cereals there is no loss of wildlife habitat there.	The support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15684	Mark Aston					I have been reading the Rural Vision 2031 document which went on-line this morning, and I see that: 1. In its proposals for Risby, the Council is not adhering to the limit in the adopted Core Strategy of ten homes per development site in Local Service Centres (Barningham, Great Barton, Ingham, Rougham and Wickhambrook are similarly affected), 2. The timing of proposed development in Risby has been revised from '2021-2031' to 'short term,' and the size of the site concerned has been increased from 1.1. to 1.3 hectares, despite multiple objections to the original proposal from residents and the Parish Council, 3. The Parish Council's attitude toward proposed development on this site has been seriously misrepresented.	The size of the site was increased and the timescale brought forward to accommodate the pre-school on the site. Now that this has been developed on another the site the site will revert to 1.1ha with development to occur in the medium term	Amend policy to reduce size of site and bring phasing date later to medium term

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Aston					<p>In 2010, I explained that to the ordinary reader the limit of ten homes in the Core Strategy represented a clear statement of the scale of development planned by the Council in Local Service Centres. I also expressed the view that the Council's failure to make any reference to this limit when it was breached several times in the 2010 Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document was more likely to be deceitful than accidental. By not making an explicit statement in the Rural Vision document about its decision to abandon the limit, the Council is again failing to make its intentions clear.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.11.4 of the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document proposed a site of 1.1 hectares adjacent to the Risby cricket pitch with an indicative capacity of 20 houses, and stated that 'development will only be permitted after the phasing date shown' which was 2021-2031.</p>	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	Amend policy to reduce size of site and bring phasing date later to medium term

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mark Aston					<p>Although a range of objections were voiced about the scale and impact of the proposal by residents and the Parish Council, Policy RV18 of the Rural Vision document now seeks to increase the size of this site to 1.3 hectares and classify it as suitable for development in the 'short term'</p> <p>Paragraph 35.9 of the Rural Vision document quite wrongly suggests that the Parish Council is 'not averse to the development' proposed on this site. I attach below a copy of a letter sent to Mr Poole in 2010, which makes the Parish Council's objections to development of this scale on this site completely unambiguous. A scanned copy of a more recent e-mail to Stephen Burgess about the proposed development by Pigeon Homes makes it very clear that the Parish Council continues to object to excessive proposals on this site and that a development of less than ten houses would be supported.</p> <p>I object to your proposals for Risby, and I do hope</p>	The Parish Council's objection is noted.	Remove any reference in document to Parish Council's support.
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15693	Helen Abrey				no	In the original Local Development Framework it was agreed that Risby was a Local Service Centre. Any development should be small: 1. No more than 7 dwellings per site 2. Not before 2021 3. A proposition should be affordable housing. This site has been proposed on several occasions by the developers and time after time they are trying to extend this site, claiming it is two sites and are trying to develop it in the short term. Also there are too many accesses on one junction. It was agreed that Risby be allowed to develop slowly as it had been doing in the last 20 years. This development needs to have restrictions placed on it as agreed. I also feel the parish needs more affordable housing.	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	No changes required
RVR15694	Helen Abrey				no	In the original Local Development Framework it was agreed that Risby was a Local Service Centre. Any development should be small: 1. No more than 7 dwellings per site 2. Not before 2021 3. A proposition should be affordable housing This site has been proposed on several occasions by the developers and time after time they are trying to extend this site, claiming it is two sites and trying to develop it in the short term. Also there are too many accesses on one junction. It was agreed that Risby be allowed to develop slowly as it had been doing in the last 20 years. This development needs to have restrictions places on it as agreed. I also feel the parish needs more affordable housing.	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			no	3.2 Section 35 Risby. Whilst the Core Strategy at CS2 refers to development at Risby being possible if it is fully screened, Breckland Council considers the site chosen for residential (RV18) to not be fully screened as it is not screened on all sides by existing development. There appear to be alternative locations for this proposal within an area of land screened on all sides by development or further to the east, outside of the buffer. There is a lack of justification for the choice of site for residential development. Furthermore, the HRA that accompanies the Rural Vision states the need for a Project Level HRA; this is not mentioned in RV18. It is currently unclear whether a project-level HRA of a site that is not fully screened on all sides would be able to satisfactorily conclude that an adverse effect on site integrity could be avoided. Based on the available and accepted scientific evidence at the present time strategic avoidance is the only solution.	The Habitat Regulations Screening Assessment has not raised any issues in relation to the sites. Natural England have not raised an objection to the allocation of the sites.	A map of the 1500m buffer to be included in the opportunities and constraints document. A reference to the need for a project level HRA to be inserted in the policy text.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council				<p>With regards to employment allocation (RV3h), again this is in the 1,500m buffer and is not screened on any sides. There is a lack of justification for the site. The choice of site goes against CS2 criteria.</p> <p>In the Opportunities and Constraints document, page 71 shows the constraints around Risby, but does not include the 1,500m buffer despite it being mentioned in the text.</p> <p>Breckland Council objects to the approach to Risby in the Rural Vision document. Breckland Council considers that the DPD fails to meet the Core Strategy requirements in that the housing allocation in Risby is not screened on all sides and that the employment allocation in Risby is not screened at all. The 1,500m buffer needs to be administered equally across the wider area in order to avoid cumulative impacts of development and change on the Breckland SPA.</p>	See above	See above
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation of the northern part attached to any planning consent. (The southern half of RV18a has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area)	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15836	D.Spencer				no	<p>I object to the proposal RV18 as the indicative capacity is far too great and time scale too soon bearing in mind the contents of the Council's own Core strategy document, the wishes of the residents as set out in the Risby Parish plan and in the comments made in respect of previous suggestions for this site during the consultation process (you touch on some of these in para 35.8 of the Rural Vision) and more recently in respect of planning application SE/11/1426 where residents and the Parish Council submitted written responses objecting to the application.</p> <p>A development of this size is out of keeping for this village, is in respect of precious greenfield land which should be preserved, and is not sustainable development as it will put an intolerable strain on the village sewerage system and on already inadequate narrow village roads.</p> <p>The reference to a playschool is no longer relevant as one is in the course of construction adjacent to the Village Hall.</p>	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	Policy amended to reduce size of site and bring phasing date later to medium term
	D.Spencer					In view of the documented objections by Risby residents to a development of this size on this site I am at a loss to know why the Council persist in its consideration of it especially when we are told on the Council website that the Rural Vision 2031 has been drafted "so that it reflects the views of local people".	See above	See above

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no	<p>We would like to take this opportunity to confirm that our client, Pigeon, on behalf of the landowner MacRae Estates, is the promoter of this site.</p> <p>We can confirm that the site remains available for development. We consider that development of the site for the 20 dwellings proposed, would be both suitable and achievable and therefore deliverable, as required by the NPPF. Development of the site would also be viable.</p> <p>We therefore fully support the identification of this site for housing development in the Rural Vision 2031 document.</p> <p>We also welcome the proposed development of this site in the short term.</p> <p>We enclose an indicative layout plan to show how the site could be developed.</p> <p>We do not consider that it should be necessary for a Development Brief to be agreed before a planning application will be considered. We believe that this requirement would add unnecessary costs and delays to delivery of development of the site. Government guidance contained within 'Planning and Development Briefs: A Guide to Better Practice', states that a planning brief may not be necessary wh (See attached site layout)</p>	Agree that now the pre-school has been developed on an alternative site there is no requirement for a site development brief	Policy amended to remove the requirement for a site development brief
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	yes	We fully support the proposed allocation of the site south of School Road, Risby, but consider the arbitrary allocation of three-quarters (1.26ha) of the (1.70ha) land parcel to be unrelated to the availability of developable land. An extension to the southern field boundary would be entirely consistent with the adjacent development pattern as defined by Alexander Way to the east. The full area of land is immediately available and deliverable. The indicative capacity of the site as shown within draft Policy RV18 needs to be updated to omit the reference to the Pre-school. A Pre-school was approved by Suffolk County Council February 2012 (Reference SE/11/1512) on land adjacent the Village Hall. Therefore, after taking into account the removal of the Pre-school and the increase in developable site area, an increase from 20 to 25 units is proposed. The density at 25 units on the enlarged site would remain appropriately low for Risby whilst being entirely consistent with the NPPF in seeking the optimal sustainable development potential for the site.	The capacity of the site is being maintained at 20 dwellings with a reduced size of 1.1ha for medium term development now that the site is not required to deliver the pre-school.	Amend policy to reduce size of site and bring phasing date later to medium term

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.		<p>A development of 25 units would respect the local character and identity of the surroundings and allow the units to be built away from the Conservation Area which includes the northern (narrow) section of the proposed site. The increase of 5 units is not so significant as to undermine the strategic housing trajectory of the adopted Core Strategy. The mix and type of housing will deliver a wider choice of quality homes and reflect local demands.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Risby will be close to local amenities, including the pre-school, primary school, village hall, farm food shop, public house, bus stops (in either direction) and also to the employment sites, including the 2.5 ha proposed Risby site (Policy RV3H). The enlarged site area would remain outside the 500m Consultation Distance Zone, as requested by the Health and Safety Executive, with regards to the Calor Saxham site.</p>	See above	See above
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

**Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV18a), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. (The southern half of RV18a has been evaluated and no further archaeological investigation is required in this area). Risby school is yet to be consulted on as part of the school organisation review and so it is difficult to accurately predict capacity issues. Whilst, based on the current scenario, the school could cope with the projected additional 5 pupils, the school site is well below the 14 minimum area for a school of its size and as such the county council is currently researching options for increasing the school's site area. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	The comments are noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) The veteran oak tree in the south west corner of this site should be buffered from any development. It is also noted that this is located within one of the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) buffer zones identified in Policy CS2 of the St Edmundsbury BCore Strategy Development Plan Document.	The need to buffer the oak tree will be dealt with at the development brief and planning application stage.	The need to buffer the oak tree mentioned in supporting text
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no	As stated above, the rural natural & built environment & heritage of Risby as a village on the outskirts of a market town needs to be protected better. Building a further 20 houses on a greenfield which abutts traditional Suffolk farm buildings which have been carefully converted 30 years ago, is unnecessary & simply satisfies developers greed.	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no	The Parish Council objects to the proposals in the draft policy and would like to point out that some of the information in the document is incorrect. Section 35.9 states that the Parish Council was not averse to the development if it delivered the preschool. This is incorrect in fact the opposite is true. The Parish Council objected to the housing development and the building of the preschool on site 7.11a and submitted the following responses:	The Parish Council's objections are noted.	Remove any reference in document to PC's support.
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				The Council stands by the response it submitted to the Borough Council on 27th May 2010. Section 4.52 of the Core Strategy Submission Document stated that a limit of ten homes was considered appropriate for one site in a Local Service Centre. The Council supports a development of less than ten houses (ideally 7 as stated in their previous response as this reflects the view of the majority of residents in Risby in the Parish Plan). Of the 168 responses, 119 residents felt that Risby could accommodate new housing, but 60 people felt that future housing should be in groups of 5 houses or less and 70 people felt that housing should be made up of single dwellings within the existing housing settlement.	Small site allocations will not deliver affordable housing. This site allocation will deliver 6 affordable homes whereas a site of 7 homes would deliver around 1 affordable home	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				The Core Strategy stated that no development would take place until 2021 and the Council would like this timescale to be adhered to. The Council would like more affordable housing to be included in any proposals for development within Risby. This application will only provide 20% of affordable housing which is below the Boroughs guidelines of 30%. The cost of housing in Risby is very high and the Council would like to see a better mix of housing with more smaller houses for young families and first time buyers.	The site would provide 30% affordable housing in line with Core Strategy Policy CS5. The Core Strategy did not allocate any sites in Risby or state that development would not take place until 2021.	The policy has been amended to bring phasing date later to medium term as the pre-school is no longer required on this site
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				The existing drainage infrastructure in Risby is already struggling to cope with demand and the main sewer along Flempton Road already blocks at least twice a year. The provision of 25 new homes will exacerbate this problem considerably. Traffic movements into School Road will increase with additional cars using the junction into School Road. Access into the proposed development will be on a difficult junction with poor visibility down School Road towards the church especially as there will be two access roads leading onto School Road the existing road into Quays Barns and the access road to the proposed site.	Suffolk County Highways have stated that a transport assessment would be required. The need for improvements and/or upgrades to water infrastructure is mentioned in supporting text	The need for a transport assessment is referred to in the supporting text. The need for improvements and/or upgrades to water infrastructure is mentioned in supporting text

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				<p>Concerns have been made by residents about a possible Anthrax risk on the site. The Council would like these concerns to be thoroughly investigated before any development takes place. The Council objected to the application for a pre-school for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is so far removed from the primary school and the village hall car park that it will lead to additional traffic movements at pick up and drop off times. The Council does not believe that the majority of parents would use the footpath across the playing field to the preschool, particularly in bad weather and on dark nights and that this will lead to an increase in traffic in School Road.</p>	The policy makes provision for better footpath links to the school and village centre.	No changes required
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				<p>Parents choosing to walk along the School Road will have to cross School Road twice to get to the pre-school at peak times when School Road is busy and there are no safe crossing points. Children attending before and after school care will have to walk to and from the primary school either along the proposed footpath or along school road as the preschool is away from the primary school. The proposed site does not provide parking for parents dropping off and picking up children both from the preschool and the before and after school clubs. This will mean that cars will have to park on the access road into the development. Access into the proposed development is on a difficult junction with poor visibility down School Road towards the church especially as there will be two access roads leading onto School Road the existing road into Quays Barns and the access road to the proposed site.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				<p>These objections to development on the site remain, though it would appear that they have been completely ignored. The claim that site 7.11a is a suitable location for a pre-school building is no longer relevant as a new pre-school is going to be built on land next to the village hall.</p> <p>As stated above the Rural Vision Document proposal for one site of 20+ dwellings goes against the wishes of the Parish Council and residents who are in favour of smaller developments of 5-7 houses.</p>	The capacity of the site is being maintained at 20 dwellings in the medium term now that the site is not required to deliver the pre-school.	Amend policy to reduce size of site and bring phasing date later to medium term
	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council				<p>Paragraph 7.11.4 of the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document proposed a site of 1.1 hectares and stated that development would only be permitted after 2021. Policy RV18 of the Rural Vision document now seeks to increase the size of this site to 1.3 hectares and classifies it as suitable for development in the short term which again goes against the wishes of the Parish Council and residents.</p> <p>The Council also questions the claim that there is a regular bus service from Risby to Bury as there are only 5 direct buses a day.</p> <p>The Council would also like to make it clear that these objections would be relevant to any large development proposed in Risby for the reasons given.</p>	See above	See above
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion	Increased Traffic flow density into Bury St Edmunds Newmarket Road add Westly 450 houses Barrow 179 Houses etc. Road plans in place before development starts. Otherwise Bury St Edmunds will become a "mirror" Cambridge traffic Nightmare	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21752E	Jean Beard				no	How many versions of this policy are there to be? Once Risby had been designated a Local Service Centre then no more than 10 houses are supposed to be built on any one site for the many reasons stated by many of the villagers in the last consultation. Please note that, in the Village Plan, the majority would prefer no more than 5-7 per site. Yet here we have a plan for 20 plus (I believe it was 25 or 26) houses. I understand from one of the planning officers that this is because there is no problem with putting double the allocation on one site since more than one site of 10 houses is acceptable. This really is semantics and refusing to take seriously the concerns of the villagers that any development should be small enough to fit into the Village without too much strain on roads, water, schools etc. and should not affect the character of the village.	The Core Strategy states 'around 10 dwellings' with the actual level of housing in each settlement being determined through the infrastructure and environmental capacity of that settlement.	No changes required
	Jean Beard					I also note that the application spoken of in Rural Vision 2031 includes a pre-school building. Since negotiations between the Village Hall Charity Trust and the Pre-School Group to find a site for this building have been on-going for about 2 years and were reaching agreement when this planning application was submitted, I am amazed the the planning authorities gave it the credence it appears to have done, including the fact that development would be allowed almost immediately, rather than in 2021, as stated in the 2010 document. Who exactly is driving this process and to whose benefit? Those making the application were well aware of the situation re the Pre-School and the Village Hall Trust and now a site has been agreed and the Pre-School is under construction I see that the application has been withdrawn.	Noted	The references to the pre-school to be removed from the policy

Rural Vision 2031
Question 43: Risby (RV18)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 43a - Doyou agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?	Question 43b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Jean Beard					I don't doubt that it will resurface at some point and when that happens I hope the planners will not just pay lip service to the criteria agreed for Local Service Centres and will therefore only agree to a maximum of 10 homes to any one site in 2021, not 20 plus houses immediately. Or is this like referendums where the same question will keep being asked until the parishioners give the right answer? Also, re item 35.9, I believe I was at the Parish Council meeting mentioned and to say that the Parish Council were not averse to development if it delivered the pre-school is not how I recall what was said. I seem to remember that the Parish Council stated a preference for the pre-school to be on Village Hall Land and also questioned the number of houses in the application with all the reservations already stated in 35.8. I also believe that a search for other sites for development within the village should not be dismissed or ignored.	The Parish Councils objections are noted.	Remove any reference in document to PC's support.
	Jean Beard					There may well be enough small sites that, including this site, together would eventually add up the 20 houses that Risby has been allocated in the consultation.	See above	See above
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15748	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>Members are agreed that the proposed housing should be sited to the rear of 52/54 Kingshall Street and Kings Close rather than as currently shown (marked red), which would, in effect, extend Kingshall Street. It is considered that the red area would be better utilised as amenity land with, perhaps, a children's play area serving the locale. It is understood that Messrs Rougham Estates are likely to be amenable to the provision of this land for such a purpose.</p> <p>Map</p> <p>No map showing the whole of the parish has been provided. One needs to be produced encompassing Rougham (including the air field) and the proposed Moreton Hall and Rushbrooke Lane extensions. Such a map will provide the necessary clarity.</p>	It is not considered appropriate to locate the housing to the rear of these properties as it would open up land either side for development which would be over an above the capacity of the settlement at this time. The rural vision does not take account of parish boundaries and it is not considered appropriate to include a map of the boundary.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>Health</p> <p>As mentioned within the Rural Vision 2031 document, the average age of the rural population is significantly higher than in the towns. However, no mention is made of the provision of a part-time health centre to be operated from the Rougham Sports Hall. With the admitted poor public transport within the village, we consider this to be essential to the future health of the ageing population.</p> <p>Rougham Airfield</p> <p>It is considered important to the whole of St Edmundsbury, and beyond, that Rougham Airfield continues to be used as a recreational area, which includes the use of aircraft and air displays. Therefore any development of the area next to the airfield has to take into consideration the flight-paths currently operated.</p>	Rougham airfield is considered in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 document.	Reference to be made to the part time health centre at the Sports Hall
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>Housing</p> <p>Any discussion concerning housing is distorted by the developments on Moreton Hall and Rushbrooke Lane and by the possibility that the Localities Bill going through Parliament currently will allow the development of redundant farm buildings without the necessary planning consents. Excluding these problems, the Planners have envisaged 15 to 20 homes being constructed within Rougham in the period up to 2031 in a location to which the Parish Council has raised significant objections.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				The 'Vision', therefore, is: i) That the extension on Moreton Hall and possibly the Rushbrooke Lane development within the Parish boundaries should remain within the Parish and that they should be sustainable and not interfere with the operation of Rougham Airfield as a leisure facility including the use as an Airfield. ii) That all developments are done within the framework adopted by the Parish Council i.e. not on the site suggested by the Borough Planners and not in locations significantly away from the main residential areas of Rougham i.e. any development should be done within Kingshall St and Mouse Lane/Newthorpe parts of the village. iii) That within this framework ALL aspects of housing needs are considered h) Leisure	The Vision documents do not take account of parish boundaries	No changes required
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				The 'Rural Vision 2031' document did not show the Airfield, which we feel is a significant benefit to the Parish, as well as to a much wider area and thus our 'Vision' is that it is maintained and not put in jeopardy by the Moreton Hall extension. Mouse Lane now has a new playground, admittedly aimed at the younger children and their challenge will be the development and upkeep of that area. We need to establish what the youngsters at Kingshall St need and how that need can be achieved. Our 'Vision' for the younger members of the community would be the development of recreation facilities and activities in all parts of the Parish to be paid for by fund-raising and grants.	The airfield is considered in the Bury Vision 2031 document	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>The Parish Plan envisaged needs for the older generations - not only the 'aged' generation - and here the 'Vision' is for self funding educational classes in the Sports Hall, more activities centred at the Sports Hall and establishment of clubs, such as a book club and gardening club.</p> <p>Our 'Vision' therefore is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The maintenance of the Rougham Airfield as a recreational area, which includes the use of aircraft and air displays. ii) The continual development of the Mouse Lane play area funded by funds raised and by grants given. iii) The development of recreational activities for all younger age groups within the Kingshall St part of the village funded by funds raised and by grants given. iv) The creation of self-funding further education and vocational courses at the Sports Hall. v) The creation of more vocational clubs such as a 'book club' and 'gardening club'. vi) The maintenance of the Library service. 	The Parish Council's vision for Rougham is noted and the Council is happy to work with the Parish to explore the issues raised.	No changes required
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				<p>i) Transport</p> <p>Here our aspirations relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Traffic calming in Moat Lane with flashing speed limit signs. ii) Increased area of speed limit restrictions throughout the Parish. iii) Reduction of traffic along the upper part of Rushbrooke Lane following development of the early part of Rushbrooke Lane. iv) Installation of 'Children at play' signs in the areas with children such as Mouse Lane, Smithy Close etc. v) The introduction of double yellow lines in parking black spots e.g. Moat Lane, parts of Kingshall St, part of New Rd and in front of the Bennet Arms PH. 	The Parish Council's vision for Rougham is noted and the Council is happy to work with the Parish to explore the issues raised.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				vi) The improvement and expansion of cycle paths. vii) With regard to public transport, our 'Vision' would be to increase the bus service to Bury St Edmunds which could attract an increased use, along with a bus link, to the railway stations at the times of the trains and the availability of daily buses to West Suffolk College. This could possibly be achieved by the creation of a Community Bus Service. Our 'Vision' therefore is to create a safer environment for the residents and visitors to the villages, and enhanced public transport.	The Parish Council's vision for Rougham is noted and the Council is happy to work with the Parish to explore the issues raised.	No changes required
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				h) Other matters Our 'Vision' would be the improvement of the appearance of the Parish by: i) The planting of spring bulbs along the verges. ii) More regular verge cutting. iii) The improvement and maintenance of all village signs, iv) Stricter controls on dog fouling. v) The stopping of horse riding on rural footpaths and the continued unhindered access to the rural footpaths along with the 'permissive paths'. vi) The continual maintenance of the war memorial. We view the continuation of the Rougham VC Primary School, the Village Shop and Post Office, the two Public Houses and the three Churches as essential.	The Parish Council's vision for Rougham is noted and the Council is happy to work with the Parish to explore the issues raised.	No changes required
	Mrs P Lamb	Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council				k) Conclusion In conclusion, our 'Vision' is for the maintenance of the peace and tranquillity of the Parish whilst improving the well-being of the population and the environment, and the bringing together of the diverse parts of the Parish to make the whole Parish worth more than the sum of the individual parts	The Parish Council's vision for Rougham is noted and the Council is happy to work with the Parish to explore the issues raised.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15755	Chris Nicholls and Susan Webb				no	We wish to comment on St Edmundsbury Council's Rural Vision document and specifically the proposal for housing in Rougham (site RV19a). We live opposite the proposed site and, whilst understanding the need for further housing we consider the proposal at RV19 to be unsuitable for a number of reasons: 1. Kingshall St is a busy and, at places narrow, rural road with the national speed limit (60mph) for most of its length. Traffic approaching from the south often travels fast and is still decelerating when passing the proposed site which is only just within the 30mph limit. 2. Road visibility at this point is hampered when approaching from the south by curves in the road leading to fairly frequent episodes of heavy braking as cars seek to avoid each other and at least one serious accident in recent years.	There is no overriding objection to development on this site from Suffolk Highways	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Chris Nicholls and Susan Webb					<p>3. There is significant heavy goods vehicle traffic along Kingshall St throughout the year but especially through the sugar beet harvesting period. Again, vehicles having to take avoiding action for HGVs on the section of road where the development is proposed is a relatively common occurrence.</p> <p>4. There is a very busy and active farm yard next to the proposed site which is noisy as vehicles manoeuvre and would not be safe at all if children should stray onto it. It has storage for agricultural chemicals and sees tanker deliveries and various tractors, crop sprayers etc being filled throughout the daylight hours for much of the year.</p> <p>5. There are no pedestrian footpaths from the proposed site to the village centre nor sufficient width in Kingshall St to provide them. Children going to school and residents wanting to use the shop or pub would have to walk along the carriageway of a busy road which means the only safe way of getting to properties on the proposed site is by car.</p>	The policy makes provision for footpath links to the village	The policy has been amended to include provision for improved footpaths along Kingshall Street
	Chris Nicholls and Susan Webb					<p>6. The proposed development would itself further increase traffic in a northward direction through the residential part of the village. In view of the above we are unable to see how the proposed site could be made safe or into a pleasant or sustainable living environment and hope the proposal will be reconsidered.</p>		

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15756	Susan Elsom				no	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed new development in the area West of Kingshall Street. We have four children and are extremely anxious of the increased dangers this development could bring.</p> <p>there has been very limited consultation time and still not all residents have been made aware of these proposals, this is unfair and unjust.</p> <p>There is another area much nearer to path across fields to Primary Sch which would be far more sensible to use for family housing</p> <p>Sewage and draining issues have not been looked into not enough public transport from this end of village [again other site on bus route]</p> <p>development is actually outside of existing development boundary</p> <p>highly dangerous area by busy farm with huge agricultural machines in constant use</p> <p>ditches either side of road which have had cars ending up in them, no footpaths !!</p> <p>our wall into property has been knocked down previously due to bend in road change of speed right near proposed site which will increase accidents breeding place for wildlife</p>	The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth. Issues such as sewage, the design of the site will be considered at the planning application stage	No changes required
	Susan Elsom					All these and probably many more concerns need to be addressed before we would even consider agreeing to such dreadful plans when existing areas seem much more suitable to such plans.	Noted	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15792	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock				no	<p>We write to express our objections with regards to the draft policy RV19 for the development of agricultural land into housing at the southern end of Kingshall Street, Rougham. We have been residents in Kingshall Street for many years now, but coupled with this is our balanced viewpoint as people who have a good understanding of local planning policies and the need for additional housing (BSc Construction Management and now director of small local building firm) and also people who have the best interests of the community at heart (member and ex-chairman of Rougham Playing Field Management Committee) and active members of the Baptist Church at the far end of Kingshall Street.</p> <p>The reasons we object to this proposal are as follows: -</p>	Comments noted	No changes required
	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock					<p>1. Development boundaries - this proposed site is outside the existing development boundary of the village - what is the point of having boundaries if they can be moved to suit the the changing policies of the Council, now that there is pressure to provide additional housing. I am sure that if Rougham Estate had applied for Planning Permission to build 2 or 3 houses along the front of this proposed site which would be more in-keeping with the rest of Kingshall Street the application would have been rejected - why a different approach for mass development of 'mixed' housing? What alarms us most is the fact that the proposed site not only infills the line from the back of the Kings Close development (see point 2) to the back of the agricultural buildings (see point 3) but leaves the field behind open for development in the future.</p>	The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth. The allocation of new sites does alter the housing settlement boundary. The site will be developed to allow future growth in this location should it be required beyond 2031	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock					2. The Kings Close development has raised serious concerns about the Council's ability to enforce its own decisions. Why was one of the Conditions to provide a footpath along the front of the site put in on the original permission if it was so easily appealed against and overturned to effectively suit the developer fitting an additional property onto the site. As a result of trying to fit too many properties on the site, not only is there no footpath for residents further down Kingshall Street and walking to the church etc, but there is also cars nearly permanently parked on the street. Additional housing would only worsen the danger caused by this situation, particularly given the fact that this would be relatively high density housing, many of which would be for families with young children.	The need for a footpath is recognised	The policy has been amended to include provision for improved footpaths along Kingshall Street
	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock					3. Farm yards and buildings are notoriously dangerous places and although I appreciate that Rougham Estate keep Kingshall Farm in good order, there is currently no secure fencing or lockable buildings. With additional housing comes additional children who by nature would want to explore such agricultural building and machinery. Additionally, there is significant noise from machinery operating on the farm, often late into the night or very early in the mornings - not very suitable for a residential area. 4. Is the existing infrastructure adequate? There seems to have been very little pre-thought gone into this proposed site to check the suitability. We have reason to believe the sewage system is nearly at capacity already from the trouble we have from the mains backing up. The vehicular access to the proposed site is dangerous - on a sharp blind bend at the end of a long straight and fast road. Now that the Kings Close development has put pay to there being any hope of a footpath along the road, this	Issues such as visibility for cars, design of the site will be considered at the planning application stage	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock					<p>Is the school able to cope if there are additional children from these houses?</p> <p>5. We also have concerns that the the Parish Council (whom I will be writing to seperately) are pushing this site without applying logic to the situation and their judgement is being clouded by the incentive of the developer having to provide a play area. For the reasons mentioned above regarding safety, a play area in this location seems ridiculous.</p> <p>6. If one element of the planning policy is to provide housing close to existing village facilities (although we do feel that any additional housing would unbalance both the geopgraphy and demography of the village), surely a better location would be on the alotments opposite the Bennett Arms pub, the extensive grounds of the pub, or the field further along Moat Lane from Smithy Close. Access to the school, shop, pub, playing field and A14 are far better from any of these sites, not to mention more suitability from the safety point of view.</p>	Infrastructure issues are further dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	No changes required
	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock					These are the main reasons that we do not feel that this site is suitable to development and we trust that you will take our objections into account when considering this proposal further.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15818	Ian and Christina Ogden				no	<p>We wish to make comment in respect of the proposed housing development for 12 houses with potential for further expansion in the area of the south of Rougham on kingshall street to the southern extremity of the village. We have the following observations on the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site does not consolidate the village but seeks to further stretch it's boundaries to the overall detriment of the village. 2. The traditional village heart is the church and school. During the plague the village spread to its current boundaries. The aim of the vision should be to consolidate the village towards its central amenities. There are sites to the north of kingshall street that would meet this vision. 3. The potential site has appalling access. The potential access is restricted in its location by the adjacent pond. This pond and ditch on the boundary of kingshall farmhouse restricts the road width to single carriageway. There have been to our knowledge been a number of accidents at this location due to spending vehicles. 	The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth. A site to the north of the village was previously considered and has been discounted as this site is better located.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian and Christina Ogden					<p>Those coming from the south are blind to the bend just before this restriction. Having an access just after this restriction from the west side of the road would exacerbate the risk.</p> <p>4. It is unlikely that access could be engineered to meet current highway junction design without compromise, which should be considered inappropriate for a new development.</p> <p>5. There is no footpath along this part of the road all the way up to beyond kings close. These houses would contain families and the lack of this basic infrastructure is a real risk particularly for children along kingshall street.</p> <p>6. There is very poor and limited street lighting South of kings close again adding to the severity of the risk</p> <p>7. The site being so far away from the church and school does not encourage a green agenda of either walking or cycling.</p> <p>8. The site is adjacent to the working farm with heavy farm traffic and noise. For these reasons they would not attract a quality development and a good standard of living to any occupants.</p>	The need for a footpath is recognised. The housing mix will include market and affordable homes. The design of the site will be considered at the planning application stage	The policy has been amended to include provision for improved footpaths along Kingshall Street

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Ian and Christina Ogden					<p>9. The vision makes no mention of the type of development. The housing mix in the village needs to be balanced and the lack of discussion on this point fails to provide sufficient information for villages to make a valid judgement on its appropriateness. Until this is defined no proposal should be accepted.</p> <p>10. The vision should concentrate on finding a site within the village boundary and not extend the village boundary in the south. If the kingshall street boundary is to be breached then a development should be placed to the north of kingshall street.</p> <p>We are not opposed to the limited expansion of the village. However, we believe that due to very poor and dangerous access and the inappropriate extension of the village to the south rather than its consolidation the vision for Rougham needs to be revisited with a view to selecting a site between the north of kingshall street and the traditional centre of the village to improve its density, preferably within the limits of the existing village boundary.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15832	Michael Elsom				no	<p>I write to you with my objections to the proposed new development in Kingshall St, Rougham.</p> <p>I live at Green Wheat Barn, Kingshall Street Rougham Bury St Edmunds IP30 9LG, with four children and have great concerns over this Development, the dangers and what damage it will do to our environment</p> <p>*There is a much more practical site nearer to the primary school *The road near site will have to be assessed as this narrows near this entrance, which has regular minor accidents. *Speed reductions will have to be placed much further out of village as traffic passes this point in excess of 40mph *The farm that is next to site is in constant use. *Sewage and drainage system will need to be re addressed, as well as road drainage. *Public transport is not suitable from this end of village to cope with extra housing whereas the other site is on a bus route.</p>	The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth.	No changes required
	Michael Elsom					<p>*This falls outside the existing development boundary *There is no footpath from site until you near the post office. *What assessment has been made on the wildlife and environment around this site.</p> <p>These and other issues must be addressed before agreement can be made although this does seem to be the wrong location.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society				The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15898	E P Farrage				no	I wish to object to the proposal of 12 houses (and possibly more in the future) adjacent to the Kingshall Farm buildings for the following reasons:- 1) The development extends the village to the south, away from the centre and village amenities. Extra traffic will be using the narrow Kingshall Street, made more hazardous by parked cars on the highway. 2) It is obviously not appreciated the hazards that we at the south end experience:-	The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	E P Farrage					a) the development will access onto the narrow Kingshall Street, near a bend with restricted visbaility of traffic into the village from the south. Approaching traffic travel at excessive speeds and indeed traffic accelerate out of the village prematurely at excessove speed. Our exit is next to the 30mph sign, and on many occasions have had near misses with speeding vehicles from both directions. b) There are no footpaths at the south end and I have also witnessed many near misses with dog walkers and especially young mothers with their pushchairs.	The need for footpaths is recognised. There are no overriding highways objections which would prevent this development from coming forward	The policy has been amended to include provision for improved footpaths along Kingshall Street
	E P Farrage					c) With ditches on either side, there appears to be little scope for road widening or indeed provision of a path throughout. The footpath should have been extended during the recent build of Kings Close. d) The proposed development is next to farm buildings, with heavy plant operating, an obvious hazard to children and undoubtedly there would be a noise problem for the new houses	The design of the site will be considered at the planning application stage	No changes required
	E P Farrage					3) I understand there already exists a sewage problem at the south end of Kingshall Street which will be exacerbated with a new build. We, at Kingshall Barns have a sewerage pumping station, which when operating, must aggravate the problem.	The recognition of potential sewerage issues should be referenced in the text	Reference made to the potential sewerage issues in the supporting text

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	E P Farrage					4) Other areas of the village should be considered for development and with the following in mind: - keeping additional vehicles off Kingshall Street and away from the village centre, access for children to the local school, access to the local shop, access to the Bennet Arms, provide a children's play area nearby (the present one is in the wrong place) then surely, development should be beyond Smithy Close accessing New Road. If one has a real vision for the future, then development should take place between New Road and Moat Lane and in doing so, take out the dangerous bend at the north end of Kingshall Street/Moat Lane ie straighten out the road, allowing further development in that area with all amenities nearby.	This site is identified in an opportunity area and is considered to be the most appropriate location for growth in Rougham	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	See attached sheet	The comments are noted.	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15933	Mr and Mrs R W Norris					<p>Consultation process: This has not been particularly extensive and some residents appear to have not been made aware of the proposal except via the notice attached to the telegraph pole alongside the road. You may feel that a more extensive consultation process is needed for such an important issue.</p> <p>The development is proposed to be outside the existing housing settlement boundary. It extends an already straggling village even more while there is plenty of available space far closer to the core of the village. It is worth noting that in 2010 the Council's own Rural Sites Allocations Preferred Options Document stated: 'There appears to be no opportunity for growth to the south of Kingshall Street due to the number of planning constraints and the fact this is the least populated area of the settlement. The lower part has a quiet rural feel and should remain available for agricultural use'. None of the documents that I have seen in the Council Offices offer any explanation of what has changed this in the meantime.</p>	The consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth.	No changes required
	Mr and Mrs R W Norris					<p>The area proposed is next to a busy farm site where heavy agricultural machines regularly work from 7am to 7pm much of the year. It is even busier at harvest. The machinery noise is intrusive and the machines dangerous. It is unwise to deliberately locate new houses where children will be present, adjacent to such a dangerous site if alternatives exist.</p> <p>The proposed site access is onto a narrow road with deep water-filled ditches on both sides, and no footpath. There is no room to widen the road, nor to create a footpath. This will make it dangerous for children to walk or cycle to school.</p>	The issues such as footpaths and design of the site will be considered at the planning application stage	Include reference in policy for need for footpaths

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Mr and Mrs R W Norris					<p>The access will be very close to the 30mph limit on a bend which restricts visibility, especially for vehicles approaching from the south. Vehicles often come into the village at excessive speed (we have had two cats killed on the bend). Moreover heavy haulage lorries are increasingly using the road as a short cut between the A134 and the A14.</p> <p>Access to the development will be across an ancient pond which will be degraded. It is not known if it is a breeding habitat for any protected species, as this has not been checked. When the King's Close development was underway 2 years ago the developer sought to cover over the small ditch there but was not allowed to because of breeding wildlife. That ditch runs into the pond affected by this development, so similar restrictions will presumably be needed.</p> <p>Nothing appears to have been done to check that the sewage/drains can cope with another 12 houses, despite some experience of sewage problems at the southern end of Kingshall Street.</p>	An ecological survey has been undertaken on site. The need to take account of sewerage issues will be referenced in the text. These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	Reference to sewerage made in the supporting text

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.						
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV19a), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Existing school capacity should be sufficient to cope with this level of growth at Rougham. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	The comments are noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Wools				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 44: Rougham (RV19)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 44a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?	Question 44b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion	Traffic Flow into town.Which way to Cheat the Conjestin.Rookey X Roads then Moreton Hall, Eastgate Street A134 via Rushbrooke / Southgate Green, A14 via Sainsbury's Round a bout.All problems NOW.Road infrastructural solutions FIRST... before build	The work being carried out to assess the impact of the strategic growth of Bury St Edmunds detailed in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031, including traffic movements around the town, will be sufficient to accommodate additional rural growth	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15792	Stuart & Elizabeth Hitchcock				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15889	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappel			no	RE: site specific consultation response, council site reference RV19a Please accept this correspondence as a response to the notice placed by St Edmundsbury Borough Council on land to the south of Kingshall Street, Rougham, specifically seeking views on the site and the proposal for a housing development located on the site. Please consider this response as a strong formal objection to the proposal to allocate the above mentioned site for housing. Specific reasons for this objection are laid out below:	The comments are noted and are not considered accurate	No changes required
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappel				Consultation Process The consultation process for this site falls short of what should be expected for such a significant proposal. It has also not met the councils own Statement of Community Involvement to maximise stakeholder and community involvement in both the LDF process and for planning applications.	The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The posting of site notices and notifying neighbours to the sites is not a statutory requirement and was undertaken as an additional consultation measure to assist the local community.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				A single A4 notice has been placed on a telegraph pole adjacent to the site in question. Please note that this notice is set back within a hedge line, is not visible unless directly passing on foot, is not viewable from a footpath and is on a dangerous section of road with bad visibility and near a speed limit change from 30 mph to the national speed limit (the latter point resulting in frequent speeding vehicles at this location)	The site notices were an additional consultation measure and are not a statutory requirement.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				As such, the notice has not been adequately advertised to local residents who would be affected by the proposal. In particular the Community Involvement Statement requires that 'information is appropriately publicised and made accessible'. The first stage of the LDF consultation process which took place between November 2008 and January 2009, specifically consulting on the core strategy element of the LDF, involved direct mailing to households, along with other means of consultation. The council should therefore use the same level of engagement and community involvement for all subsequent consultations on the LDF development, particularly in reference to site allocations which will have the most impact on local residents.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				I would request that further consultation is carried out on this site proposal with residents, with information sent direct to households within the village regarding the proposal. Residents would therefore have an opportunity to consider the proposal in an informed manner and make representations. Without this level of engagement the council will not be able to fully consider the views of local residents which may undermine the council's statutory obligations. An appropriate level of engagement would mean the following requirements of the Community Involvement Statement can be met which currently have not been:	Local Plans are required to have multiple rounds of consultation in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The Vision 2031 consultations have exceeded the SCI requirements.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappel				Ensure the views of the community are sought at the earliest possible stages and throughout the process, and include them, where possible, in the LDF process and planning applications Provide an opportunity for everyone to become involved in the planning process Encourage comment from the community Ensure that information is appropriately publicised and made accessible Informing - this level of involvement ensures that everyone has access to information and involves notifying communities about policies and proposals.	See above	No changes required
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappel				Participating - this level of involvement provides the opportunity to contribute ideas and to take an active part in developing proposals and options. Consulting - this level of involvement ensures that people are consulted and can make representations on formal proposals. This is a statutory requirement and represents the minimum in terms of community involvement.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>Feeding back - this level of involvement ensures that people will receive feedback and be informed about progress and outcomes. It will ensure that people know that their comments have been considered</p> <p>Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document April 2010</p> <p>In 2010 the council produced a rural site allocation preferred options document which provided an assessment of the village of Rougham in terms of development potential. It identified issues and constraints and possible development sites.</p> <p>Within this document a number of areas were identified and ruled out by the council's own assessment process and evidence gathering. This included areas at the Blackthorpe end of the village, and the south, east and west of Kingshall Street. It identified clear reasons why development in these areas (including the now proposed site RV19a), was not appropriate. These same constraints are still in place and provide already established evidence against development of the site now</p>	The consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The opportunities and constraints study identifies this site as an appropriate location for growth.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>There appears to be no opportunity for growth to the south of Kingshall Street due to the number of planning constraints and the fact that this is the least populated area of the settlement. The lower part has a quiet rural feel and should remain available for agricultural use.'</p> <p>'The eastern area has a small opportunity but would require the relocation of important allotment areas that are a valued facility for villagers'</p> <p>'The west area of Rougham has no major planning constraints, however there are a limited number of access points in order to locate a site in the areas behind existing housing. Rougham's linear development pattern limits opportunity in this locality.'</p> <p>'Kingshall Street has limited public open space and the village hall/playing fields are some distance away'</p> <p>'The travel to and from work bus service to Bury St Edmunds from Rougham is less than satisfactory.'</p>	See above	

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>Only one site was identified as a preferred option (identified at that time as site 7.12a), and was located to the north of Kingshall Street. However, the recorded response to this site was clearly an overwhelming objection. This provides evidence that residents are not in favour of development within Rougham.</p> <p>Many of the objections relating to the 7.12a site equally apply to the new site RV19a, notably:</p> <p>Loss of a characteristic view/visual amenity. Pedestrian safety to access village services and amenities. Greenfield site and the loss of agricultural land. Poor infrastructure in and around the Rougham area and an increase in traffic flow. The development would move the village in the wrong direction, i.e. away from its centre and would create a more linear village than at present. Drainage issues Sets a new precedent for future development</p>	The site south of Kingshall Street was not available for development at the time of the 2010 consultation. The site lies within an opportunity area and is considered to be in a more appropriate location than the site north of Kingshall Street which was consulted on in 2010.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>Development of an Alternative to Site 7.12a</p> <p>It appears that since the first rural allocations preferred options were put forward in 2010, discussions have taken place between the council, Parish Council and Rougham Estates proposing an alternative to site 7.12a. I would like to point out that no direct consultation has been carried out by the Parish Council with residents in the Kingshall Street area concerning this proposal, and as such no local support can be assumed for the parish council's proposal.</p> <p>Site Specific Issues</p> <p>The development of this site would spread the village further towards the south area of Kingshall Street already identified as important and to be protected within the 2010 Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document.</p> <p>The development would increase the linear spread of the village, again, already identified as detrimental in both the 2010 Rural Site Allocations</p>	The site being proposed does not cover the same area as the site proposed to the Council by the Parish Council. It is in an identified opportunity area adjacent to existing built development.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>The development would be on a Greenfield site and grade 2 agricultural land. This would also have a negative impact on soil resources.</p> <p>Development would affect arable land that is under environmental stewardship with field margins managed for wildlife.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>The road the site is located on is not suitable for increased traffic associated with a development of this size. It is narrow and has poor visibility due to bends before and after the proposed entrance. There are large ditches either side of the proposed entrance. The road already suffers from speeding traffic entering the village and a number of potentially dangerous traffic incidents occur, including one major incident in the last 2 years resulting in a vehicle trapped in the ditch.</p>	There are no suitable brownfield sites for development in Rougham. There are no overriding highway objections which would prevent this site from being developed.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>The road has heavy use from very large vehicles including tractors, LGVs and coaches, which already cause problems due to the narrowness of the road. A large vehicle was also involved in the incident that resulted in the vehicle trapped in the ditch.</p> <p>Vehicle use would also significantly increase at the Blackthorpe area and other areas of the village. This has already been cited by the authority as a reason to not allow development in these areas, but traffic from the Kingshall Street area would still need to access the Blackthorpe area for all non local travel, such as accessing the A14. Vehicle movements would also increase on the moat lane road which is too narrow and inappropriate for increased use as already highlighted in previous consultations.</p> <p>The existing small development at Kings Close has already increased traffic problems in this area, which would be compounded by further development. Similar increased traffic issues have also been evident at the Smithy Close development.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>Construction traffic during development would be hugely disruptive to such a minor road.</p> <p>The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 3 and is in a minor aquifer area.</p> <p>Pedestrian access is dangerous to the centre of the village with no footpath link and the above mentioned existing traffic conditions. Local residents had previously formed a petition in February 2008 highlighting the danger to pedestrians on this section of road and asked for a footpath to be installed as part of the Kings Close development, but the response from the Council was that it would not be possible to construct a path along this stretch of road. Therefore future provision for pedestrian access to the main services of the village would not be possible for a new development.</p>	The need for footpaths is recognised and reference has been made in the policy text.	Policy includes reference to need for footpaths

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>One of the reasons this site has been proposed in the Rural Vision 2031 consultation document as an alternative to the 7.12a site from 2010, is that it is nearer to services including the shop and pub. However, when the distance is measured on the ground this site is in fact further from the centre of the village and the services. In addition, access to the village services from the original proposed site was not only shorter but along existing pavements. As such this justification does not have any weight, and in fact is inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>The site would not encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth, as the bus service is less than satisfactory. Residents would be dependant on private transport for work, leisure, regular main grocery shopping trips and luxury shopping trips.</p>	This site is better related to the built form of Rougham than the site originally proposed to the north of Kingshall Street	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
		This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				Additionally, great emphasis is given within the Rural Vision 2031 consultation document to the importance of the local shop to reduce traffic movements, particularly in reference to other areas of the village being too far from the shop for development. However the pattern of use of the local shop is limited to occasional top up shopping and Sunday morning papers. The shop does not provide a viable alternative to most residents shopping needs and high personal transport use will still be a factor of the new development, however close to the local shop.	The villages status as a Local Service Centre needs to be supported with appropriate small scale housing growth.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>The location of the proposed development extends behind the line of existing development (i.e. number 54 Kingshall Street). This sets a dangerous opportunity for infill development in the future. In fact the plans contained in the Rural Vision 2031 consultation document clearly indicate that a potential access is to be retained to the area behind Kings Close. This would provide a block of land running behind the existing housing along Kingshall Street, right through to Orchard Close.</p> <p>In fact, the same block of land including site RV19a and the land running up to Orchard Close was put forward in the 2010 Rural Site Allocations process as a single site (identified as SP1 in the Excluded Sites Book March 2012). However, this site was rejected as the site 'could accommodate significantly more development than required in a Local Service Centre and would have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment and village form.'</p>	The requirements for growth in the village beyond 2031 will be considered at that time.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				By allowing development of the RV19a site along with retention of access to the rest of the plot identified as SP1, the council would be enabling future development that would clearly be against policies adopted for Local Service Centres within the Core Strategy (policy CS4). Furthermore it could be seen that development of site RV19a would enable a back door development by the same landowner that would result in a hugely inappropriate development on the whole site.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>The Rural Vision 2031 Sustainability Appraisal identifies the site is within a Conservation Area, and development would be detrimental to its character.</p> <p>However, The Rural Vision 2031 document states that 'Rougham does not have a conservation area'. This is inconsistent and seems to be an error somewhere.</p> <p>The Rural Vision 2031 document also states 'The surrounding landscape in the Rougham area is relatively flat; this prevents development that would affect key protected views to the south'. This is at odds with the proposal to allocate this site for development in the south of Kingshall Street.</p> <p>There is an existing lack of sewage capacity, particularly in this area of Kingshall Street. Problems are often found related to the pumping station located towards Bradfield St George which cannot cope with existing capacities.</p>	Rougham does not have a Conservation Area. This error in the Sustainability Appraisal will be rectified. Issues such as sewerage capacity will be dealt with at the planning application stage. Reference has been made in the supporting text to the need to investigate sewerage capacity issues.	Reference made to sewerage capacity issues in the supporting text.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				The Rural Vision 2031 Sustainability Appraisal has failed to identify this issue and in relation to water and sewage capacity has only stated that information is not available. However Anglia Water submitted a consultation response to the 2010 Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document stating that there are major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth in terms of Waste Water Treatment Works capacity. In addition infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades would be needed under an amber category to serve proposed growth in terms of water resource and supply networks as well as the foul sewage network.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				<p>The development would be against Core Strategy Policy:</p> <p>CS2:</p> <p>The development does not comply with conserving and, wherever possible, enhancing the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside and public access to them, in a way that recognises and protects the fragility of these resources;</p> <p>The development does not comply with conserving and, wherever possible, enhancing other natural resources including, air quality and the quality and local distinctiveness of soils;</p> <p>The development does not comply with protecting the quality and availability of water resources;</p> <p>The development does not comply with making a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, character, townscape and the setting of settlements;</p>	The site is adjacent to a Local Service Centre where small scale growth is encouraged to help maintain existing services and facilities.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappel				<p>CS4:</p> <p>The development is above 10 houses.</p> <p>The development would detract from the environmental quality, townscape, functional vitality and setting of the settlement as a whole.</p> <p>Identified Need for New Housing</p> <p>I object to the need for any additional housing allocations in Rougham above current levels. Figures contained in the Core Strategy for growth rates, and the subsequent rural allocations, are based on The East of England Regional Spatial Strategy. As the regional spatial strategies have been repealed by the Localism Act, the council does not need to follow housing figures laid down within the spatial strategy.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				While the council states that it will still follow these housing figures and believes they are still valid, it has not taken into account the views of local residents when forming this view. Under the Localism Act, not only does the council have the ability to disregard the spatial strategy, local residents have an increased role in setting planning policy in terms of the LDF, and as such to influence the allocation of housing sites. If residents are of the view that additional housing allocations are not needed in a locality this should be taken into account.	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	N/A	This response was supported by 32 individuals as listed below and in the attached table; Mr P Sage; G Lowden; Ms S Whitlow; Mr R Whitlow; PW Taylor; AE Taylor; Mr D Walker; Mrs D Walker; Mrs S Cutting Mr P Cutting; Mr J Lovick; R Reynolds; C A Campbell; D P Riches; R Riches; Miss D Reynolds; Mr S Evans; M Hassall; R Hassall; A Fordham; B Andrews; Mrs E Osborne; Mr M C Gosbee; Mrs Kathleen Davies; Mr Philip Bye; Mrs Helen Bye Mrs P E Holden; Mrs Lisa Lear; Alec; Fordham; Matt Vernon; Abigail Fordham Corinne Cappell				It appears that the main purpose of development within Local Service Centres such as Rougham is to ensure 'sustainable local service'. However, the current situation in Rougham in terms of housing levels, infrastructure and services is sustainable. As such Rougham does not need any further development. This appears to be the situation in Bardwell, Great and Little Thurlow and Hundon where no allocations have been put forward, even though they are identified Local Service Centres. Nowhere in the Rural Vision 2031 document has the council providing clear evidence of the need for new housing in Rougham in terms of sustainability. (See attached list of individuals signed up to this response and copy letter to Rougham PC from M Vernon)	See above	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no	See attached sheet	Comments are noted	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment to make on this issue at this time.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolfs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 45: Rougham Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 45a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 45b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15678	Mrs M Chittock				no	It is madness to even 'at this stage' suggest sharing the cemetery field between a replacement for Wickhambrook Surgery and 22 houses. The ideal space allocation would be that the entire cemetery field be exclusively devoted for surgery/pharmacy and all their staff and patients. Perhaps the Borough Council planners could research just how many patients from very many other villages travel by car to the 5 doctors and nurses, physios and pharmacy. You may be surprised. Also to suggest that car parking could overflow across the road to the MSC/WI Halls car park would not work on many days/evenings on Mondays to Fridays.	The amount of land, type and type development on the site will be determined through a site development brief.	No changes required
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15689	Mrs P. E. Bayman				yes	Wickhambrook must maintain its rural identity and the many hamlets stay as they are with no more development anywhere outside the housing settlement boundary.	Agree that the identity of Wickhambrook and surrounding hamlets should be protected. The level of growth in Wickhambrook needs to be consistent with it's designation as a Local Service Centre.	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15778	Jess Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology				No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.	Comments noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	Recognition must be given to the clustered settlement around Wickhambrook. Those areas, such as those properties at Wickham Street and the junction with the A143 Bury Road should be included within the housing settlement boundary to acknowledge the contribution that these areas continue to make to the residential accommodation available in the borough. Policy RV20 should be revised to allow sensitive development in all established built up areas or the Wickhambrook Parish.	There is a policy in the Joint Development Management Document which permits infill development in settlements without a boundary and in areas of countryside subject to meeting certain requirements.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15815	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon		no	The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (April 2010), which was published alongside the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document, established that Land north of Bunters Road is the most sustainable option for housing in Wickhambrook. There are no reasons within the updated Sustainability Appraisal (February 2012) (or in the Rural 3 Vision 2031 Preferred Options Document) to confirm why the merits of Land north of Bunters Road have been ignored. In any case, the updated Sustainability Appraisal illustrates that Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill is still less sustainable than Land north of Bunters Road. Therefore Policy RV20, the proposed change to the Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary and the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) are not justified or consistent with national policy and accordingly, those elements are not sound. This representation therefore objects to these elements.	The level of growth in Wickhambrook needs to be consistent with its designation as a Local Service Centre. The site at Cemetery Road is considered to be in the most appropriate location in relation to the villages services and facilities and built form and is the most appropriate location for the provision of a new Drs surgery.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon			<p>This representation demonstrates that if the methodology of the updated Sustainability Appraisal was also applied to the two other previous preferred options, Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill would still be no more sustainable than Land south of Bunters Road and less sustainable than Land north of Bunters Road. There are also several other very positive benefits in the allocation of Land north of Bunters Road as a residential development.</p> <p>To make the Rural Vision 2031 sound, we strongly recommend that the following amendments are made to the Rural Vision 2031 Preferred Options Document:</p> <p>1. Land north of Bunters Road should be identified by Policy RV20 as the preferred option for housing in Wickhambrook with a doctors surgery (instead of Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill).</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon			<p>2. The Housing Settlement Boundary on the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) should be moved to the west of its existing position along the rear gardens of the properties in Boyden Close and follow the existing boundaries of Land north of Bunters Road. This will enable Land north of Bunters Road to be wholly included within the housing settlement boundary.</p> <p>3. The Housing Settlement Boundary on the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) should be moved to the west of Cemetery Road and follow the existing north, west and south boundaries of Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill. This will reflect the current proposals map for the village and preserve the site's position wholly outside the housing settlement boundary.</p> <p>See separate letter for details.</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15816	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family		no	<p>Please see detailed Response (objection) outlining reasons for objection and promoting an Indicative Scheme which permits needed sustainable and viable development in this location, while conserving wildlife and biodiversity value.</p> <p>1.1 This response explains the reasons why the Bailey Family Trust and the Woollard Family are concerned about aspects of the Borough's preferred option allocation in Policy RV20 of land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill, Wickhambrook, and puts forward an alternative option for consideration.</p> <p>1.2 While this response constitutes a formal objection to the restrictions on development suggested by the preferred option allocation, the Bailey and Woollard families are keen to work with the Borough Council and the residents of Wickhambrook to reach agreement on a scheme which permits needed, sustainable and viable development in this location while conserving wildlife and biodiversity value.</p>	A further ecological survey has been undertaken on the site in June 2012 which assesses the site as being medium ecological value and following this is it considered that the amount of land suitable for development, location of uses should be informed by a site development brief. This should be produced in consultation with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to ensure that mitigation is provided for any notable species on the site.	Policy and supporting text amended to ensure the amount of land suitable for development and location of uses is informed by a site development brief. This should be produced in consultation with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to ensure that mitigation is provided for any notable species on the site.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			<p>2.3.1 Accompanying this response is a letter from the Wickhambrook Surgery (dated 22 March 2012) which confirms that the surgery's current premises are cramped and that the practice and its patients would certainly benefit from larger premises. Particular mention is made of car parking and the need for the surgery to have direct access to the highway (i.e. avoiding an access in the middle of a housing estate).</p> <p>3.1 An Ecological Scoping Survey of the site was conducted by its owners in October 2010 and a Landscape Assessment was made in June 2011. The comparatively late timing of the Ecological survey gave a different result from that which the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT) undertook for the Borough in that, taken overall, it found the site was of insignificant ecological value. However, for the purposes of the current Indicative Layout due regard has been paid to the conclusions of the SWT survey.</p>	The need for the relocation of the Drs Surgery is noted.	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			<p>4.1 The scheme in Policy RV20 restricts development to 22 dwellings in the western enclosure (including affordable housing at 30%, as required). In the eastern enclosure a doctors surgery site (to be donated) is depicted at its southern end, and an access across the field serves the proposed housing development. The remainder of the eastern enclosure is depicted as meadow. On assessment, the lack of development in this latter area raises questions of viability and deliverability given that the two enclosures are in separate ownership.</p> <p>4.2 SWT, while categorising the eastern enclosure as of Medium Biodiversity Value, suggest that it should be maintained and enhanced. However, the site is unprotected, and is not of sufficient quality to be protected by statute. Notwithstanding this, the site owners respect the biodiversity of the site and have therefore considered how best the potential difficulty may be overcome.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			<p>4.2 In arriving at the submitted scheme the owners have sought to achieve a sustainable and viable development while conserving wildlife and biodiversity value.</p> <p>5.1 The Indicative Proposal includes the following elements:</p> <p>i 21 dwellings in the western enclosure;</p> <p>ii A doctors' surgery in the eastern field plus 8 dwellings;</p> <p>iii Of the 29 dwellings in total, 9 or 10 would be affordable under present policy (as opposed to 6 or 7 dwellings if the development were to be restricted to 22 dwellings);</p> <p>iv A percentage of low cost market housing within the development (which could be reserved for local people - also please see para. 5.3, below);</p>	The amount of land available for development and the type of development will be determined through a site development brief	No changes required
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			v Provision has been made for the retention of a 10 metre wide strip along the western side of the roadside hedgerow (where the best plant species are) with a related area of meadow retained at the northern end of the eastern meadow. In addition there is an area of meadow retained around the doctors' surgery and a new area created (to accord with required open space provision) in the western meadow. Plants and seed from the eastern meadow would be translocated to help create the new western open space. All areas of grassland would be managed on a permanent basis to enhance their diversity.	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			vi There will be a public path inside the eastern hedgerow beside the road. vii A bus shelter would be included on the roadside at the southern end of the eastern meadow. 5.2 It is considered that the proposed scheme strikes a good balance between providing the local community with a new doctor's surgery site (for which there is a demonstrated requirement); additional housing of which 1/3rd will be affordable and some will be low cost; and conserving a significant area of meadow habitat.	See above	See above
	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family			5.3 In relation to the low cost housing it is noted that in the Prince's Foundation's vision statements (RV, page 17) the third refers to rural communities offering a range of housing possibilities 'and schemes for young people getting a foot on the housing ladder'. The site owners regard this as an important element in this scheme and it is for this reason they have, in addition to affordable provision, voluntarily proposed to include a proportion of low-cost market housing. See attached documents; 1. Completed Consultation Questionnaire 2. Response (Objection) on behalf of The Bailey Family Trust & The Woollard Family (John Popham Planning) 3. Indicative Layout (Brown & Scarlett Architects) 4. Copy letter from Wickhambrook Surgery (22.03.12)	See above	See above
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15824	Sally and Les Welsh				no	<p>These comments are with regard to WICKHAMBROOK and the proposed development of mixed homes and doctors surgery within the area of Nunnery Green off of cemetery road.</p> <p>My comments are as follows</p> <p>Most importantly, I understand there are no such plans or intentions for the Doctors surgery moving from its present site in the centre of Nunnery green. The present building is owned by the GP's and there are no funds presently to finance a new building. The additional homes will not provide a sufficient increase in patient population to warrant a new build, therefore I feel this suggestion in the Rural Vision 2013 is a bit of a ploy to obtain planning permission for the housing development. The site proposed for the surgery could perhaps then be proposed for further housing development in a few years time ?</p> <p>In principal small developments within Wickhambrook are required particularly affordable first time homes for young couples and families</p>	Notification has been received from the Drs Surgery regarding their intent to relocate. The site will require 30% affordable housing	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Sally and Les Welsh					<p>We understand 22 homes are proposed- though they are to be within the already built up area of Nunnery Green-creating congestion/noise/light pollution. Why cannot developments be spread out over the whole area of Wickhambrook perhaps attached to one of the other 7 greens.? Number 6 of the recommendations is "visual impact of infrastructure is kept to a minimum"- in our opinion this development would create visual congestion within a narrowing rural views and a feeling of space.</p> <p>Access to and from the area would be noisy-a possible 40+ cars to be parked etc I understand the access through a meadow which is ecologically a prime site will be put at risk.</p> <p>People from Nunnery Green regularly drive to the shop/school so the reduction of carbon emissions is not really an issue!</p>	There is a policy in the Joint Development Management Document which permits infill development in settlements without a boundary and in areas of countryside subject to meeting certain requirements. A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any application for development on the site	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council				Wickhambrook Parish Council would wish to highlight that the text on Page 116 (five lines from bottom of page) placing both the housing and doctors surgery on 'the western part of the site' does not match the diagrammatic detail on page 117 however, would still wish to make the following comments:-	The amount of land available for development and the type of development will be determined through a site development brief	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council				The Parish Council supports the proposal for 22 units and a Doctors Surgery on the whole 1.8 hectares. It does not agree that the ecological value of the eastern side of the site is significant enough to prohibit its development. The Parish Council does not support the proposal for 22 units on only the western meadow (0.725 hectares) as to accomplish this density the style and layout of housing would be out of character for the surrounding area and as a whole. This would be in contradiction to Objective 5 of Section 8. Rural Objectives. requiring the uniqueness of each village to be preserved ('does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area')	A further ecological survey has been undertaken on the site in June 2012 which assesses the site as being medium ecological value and following this is it considered that the amount of land suitable for development, location of uses should be informed by a site development brief. This should be produced in consultation with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to ensure that mitigation is provided for any notable species on the site.	Policy and supporting text amended to ensure the amount of land suitable for development and location of uses is informed by a site development brief. This should be produced in consultation with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to ensure that mitigation is provided for any notable species on the site.

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council				<p>The Parish Council considers there are two priorities for Wickhambrook when considering future development: -</p> <p>1) Affordable Housing. A local needs housing survey carried out in 2008 identified an immediate need for 10 - 12 homes. Since that date, and despite considerable effort, we have been unable to find a site acceptable to both the Borough's Planning Department and local landowners. That need is a strong as ever.</p> <p>2) Any development being considered should be of benefit to the village in the longer term. For example, if a new Doctor's surgery was built on the RV20a site it should be fit for purpose for the next 60 plus years. Any houses built on the area should be mainly of the size and capacity needed. The recent Parish Plan results could guide this aspect.</p>	The Parishes commitment to finding a site for affordable homes is recognised and the Council will continue to assist. The allocated site will provide 30% affordable homes.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council				<p>Other concerns are i) the continual urbanisation of a Borough Council elected 'centre' of our village. Wickhambrook's character is in its collection of hamlets and it is considered that small development (i.e. 2-3 houses) at each would retain this character, uphold the uniqueness, and lessen the overriding impact of development whilst meeting the required housing numbers (9.12 of Rural Vision 2031 Page 25) and ii) the density and scale of the recently permitted developments at Thorns Corner and Meeting Green remains of major concern, particularly with regard to parking. This is likely to lead to an unacceptable level of parking on the highway with a consequent increase in road accidents and similar such developments would only exacerbate such problems further.</p> <p>Your attention is drawn to Rural Objectives 1, 5 and 8 of Rural Vision 2031 (Page 22)</p>	There is a policy in the Joint Development Management Document which permits infill development in settlements without a boundary and in areas of countryside subject to meeting certain requirements. A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any application for development on the site	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15835	Pam Polson				no	<p>I consider this to be a bad idea for the following reasons :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will create more traffic going through Ashfield Green, which is already experiencing problems re increasing levels of traffic and the speed with which vehicles use this road, despite the fact that there is a 30mph speed limit. 2. This proposed development is too big given the nature of the area and the fact that this is a relatively small village with limited resources regarding local jobs, and its open areas are part of its character. 3. Recently there has been a small development and several single dwellings being constructed in Wickhambrook, but there is a limit to how much development this village can cope with. 4. A village can soon lose its identity and cease being a village - this proposed housing development has already meant that there's a possibility of a bigger doctor's surgery, and is that necessary given the surgeries at Barrow etc., 	A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any planning application on the site. The site is allocated in accordance with the environmental and infrastructure capacity of the village and its status as a Local Service Centre.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15837	David Clark				yes	Policy RV20 Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill. I am broadly supportive of the proposal in its amended form as it leaves the eastern meadow largely undeveloped and maintains the hedgerow between the two parts of the site. Moving the doctors' surgery will reduce traffic in Nunnery Green. However the new site should have traffic access to/from Nunnery Green, which currently has just one access point.	The comments are noted and support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion	The most constructive opinions are from the parishioners of the village under study	Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			no	<p>Any development on this site should be of direct benefit to the village.</p> <p>A new Doctors surgery with ample parking and a design life to serve the community for the next 40-50 years is very desirable this should be sited on the field beside the road. Back field development should be lower density than proposed in RV20 and largely consist of 'affordable' and low cost housing. The affordable element should be available to individuals with strong links in the village in perpetuity.</p> <p>The SWT assessment - the open space is of very limited ecological value (it was arable land).</p> <p>The inner field has been untended for far longer but no mention of the ecological attributes.</p>	The amount of land, type and type development on the site will be determined through a site development brief. A further ecological survey has been undertaken on the site in June 2012 which assesses the site as being medium ecological value	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15863	Anne and Andrew Shaw				no	<p>Objections to proposed development of two fields between Nunnery Green and Cemetery Road, Wickhambrook, Suffolk. April 2012</p> <p>Both fields within the proposed site are inappropriate for housing development because:</p> <p>They are Greenfield Sites and contribute to the ancient settlement pattern of small greens for which Wickhambrook is known.</p> <p>Cemetery Road is a narrow country lane with no carriageway markings (white lines). This road already serves Nunnery Green, Boyden Close, Meeting Green, Browns Close, Emily Frost Close and leads to other Greens and dwellings.</p>	Comments noted.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>At peak times Cemetery Road becomes busy. There are no footpaths for part of the way, making access to amenities dangerous for pedestrians. Wickhambrook is a farming village and agricultural machinery and vehicles use the roads on a regular basis. A combine harvester takes up all of Cemetery Road when it travels down it making it dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>From attending the Council's Drop-in Session I saw a plan and was told access was proposed from Cemetery Road, not Nunnery Green. The meadow adjacent to Cemetery Road should not be built on because it has a 'medium biodiversity value' according to the Suffolk Wildlife Trust survey. This meadow is also used as an overflow car park for village events including the annual village show and flower and vegetable show. If the meadow field goes then so does the overflow parking for village events. The meadow grass is cut each year for the village show which has helped maintain it as a meadow. During village Pantomime season Cemetery Road has cars parked along its length and on dark evenings this can be hazardous.</p>	The need for footpaths is noted. The policy will be amended to address this issue.	Policy amended to require new and improvements to existing footpaths

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>If it is still the council's intention to develop the field adjacent to Nunnery Green without the meadow (adjacent to Cemetery Road) then the only access would be from Nunnery Green itself. In this case all the above objections still apply. In addition Nunnery Green was not built to take the additional traffic further housing would bring (plus the heavy construction vehicles whilst work is underway). Nunnery Green has served additional housing from the construction of Emily Frost Close and associated housing. Nunnery Green is very narrow and there is no off road parking for the majority of residents. Most homes have at least 2 cars, and cars park in both sides of the road in places and obstruct larger and emergency services vehicles from getting to the top of Nunnery Green. I myself have difficulty some mornings manoeuvring around parked cars to get to work. Any more traffic on Nunnery Green from further housing would constitute a hazard and be detrimental to the 'ruralness' of the area.</p>	Suffolk Highways have indicated that development in this location would be appropriate	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>May I suggest the Council view the parking problems at evenings and weekends when residents are at home and see the parking problems first hand before making a decision? More housing would mean more traffic using the Cemetery Road and B1063 junction. This is a dangerous junction, on a bend and despite being in a 30mph limit there is still not enough of a view to take the turning without an element of risk. This is similar to the turning at Boyden End with the B1063 which is an alternative route but even narrower and also on a bend. Traffic doesn't stick to the speed limit because Bunters Road is a long straight between the two turnings. Any proposed changes to these junctions or traffic calming measures should be agreed under consultation before any planning is agreed. Ashley and Cheveley both have flashing speed signs but Wickhambrook has nothing. The B1063 is a main road which is used by heavy goods vehicles (and motorbikes during the summer months).</p>	A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any planning application on the site	Reference the need for a transport assessment and safety audit as part of any planning application on the site

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>The proposed development is on the other side of the B1063 to the shop (including garage and post office) and crossing the road on foot is equally risky. Children attending the school would have to walk along Cemetery Road which has no footpath past the Memorial Hall. More homes with children will mean more traffic at the school as working parents will take children to school on the way to work. This has been a problem for years and never addressed.</p> <p>If the Council decide to go ahead with the development despite objections (as was the case with Kelly's Meadow) it should be in keeping with other housing in the area. Development of 2 storey dwellings would encroach on the privacy of bungalow residents in Nunnery Green and Brown's Close.</p>	See above	See above

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>Since the original consultation when Wickhambrook was awarded Key Service Centre status and subsequently downgraded to a Local Service Centre, there have been 3 developments in this part of the village: 5 houses behind the village shop, 4 houses on Meeting Green and one rebuild in Cemetery Road (not to mention the expansion of the Gypsy and Traveller site on Kelly's Meadow which villagers objected to). These developments should be taken into account when the amount of housing Wickhambrook, as a Local Service Centre not a Key Service Centre, can sustain.</p> <p>The proposal for 22 dwellings on the site is too dense. The gardens would be too small for rural housing and for families with young children.</p>	Infill development occurs in addition to the allocation of development sites in a Local Plan.	No changes required
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>If the proposal to move the doctor's surgery goes ahead in the field adjacent to Cemetery Road, the level of traffic from people visiting the Surgery from other villages served by the 'Local Service Centre' status of Wickhambrook will cause more congestion than a smaller surgery does now. As other villages develop more people will use the Surgery, leading to even more traffic in Cemetery Road. The NHS is working towards establishing more care in the community, which means more patients attending local services, like the surgery.</p>	A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any planning application on the site	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					The Doctor's surgery is not just for Wickhambrook residents; people travel in from other villages by car. To give an example of the area covered by the Doctor's Surgery, the next nearest surgeries are Newmarket (10 miles), Barrow - part time hours (5 miles), Cheveley - open Thursdays for 1/2 an hour (5 miles), Hartest - part time hours (6 miles), Kedington - part time hours (6 miles) (Source - NHS Choices website). In my opinion the Doctor's surgery would be better positioned on the main road keeping traffic away from the lanes within the village. Perhaps it could go near the school and a small roundabout installed to keep the flow of traffic moving. Parking could then be provided for the school and the surgery.	Locating the Drs surgery in the centre of the village will increase the opportunity for trips by walking/cycling.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					<p>The two fields act as part of a wildlife corridor between the open farmland areas that surround the village. Wildlife is regularly seen on Nunnery Green as it makes its way through the existing housing, past a green space area - deer, owls, bats, hedgehogs, bullfinches and other red status species, raptors, butterflies and insects would all be affected.</p> <p>These two fields used to have a footpath from Nunnery Green to Cemetery Road running across them. Residents used it until it was sealed off a few years ago. People used to pick blackberries whilst passing through, and enjoyed the countryside walk to the village amenities until fences were erected. A village can sometimes have less access to open space than a town because although it is surrounded by open spaces, these are farmland and access is only by footpath or byway. If the meadow is going to stay then the other field could be amenity/recreation land; allotments perhaps, if there is a need. Other uses may be mentioned in the Parish Plan.</p>	<p>The site has been assessed as being medium ecological value by Suffolk Wildlife Trust (June 2012) and a development brief should be produced win consultation with SWT to help identify the developable areas of the site and mitigate any notable species present on the site</p>	<p>Supporting text amended to state that a development brief should be produced win consultation with SWT to help identify the developable areas of the site and mitigate any notable species present on the site</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					The Sustainability Evidence used in the Rural Vision is over 10 years old and out of date so is not reliable as a source of evidence to support the Council's proposals (Please see appendix 1 showing relevant support for my objections). The opportunity for employment is poor in the village with a limited amount of employers, usually employing non-skilled labour, as in most rural areas. Internet speeds are slow in the village and more users will make it even slower affecting businesses, people who work from home and online study. Public transport remains poor and is non-existent to the nearest town (Newmarket). There is a community minibus but from enquiries this is not suitable for commuter use. Any new residential dwellings, according to the Government, need to be served by adequate services. Although Wickhambrook has a part time Fire Station it doesn't have a Police House/Station and the Ambulance service is based 10 miles or more distant.	The Sustainability Appraisal (2012) was a new document drafted to support the Rural Vision 2031 preferred options document	No changes required
	Anne and Andrew Shaw					A Parish Plan is in progress, which the Council are aware of. The deadline for the end of this consultation should be extended to include information contained within the Parish Plan - to give villagers a voice.	The Parish Plan has been received by the Council.	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				In terms of the historic environment, the county council has no objection in principle to development as site RV20a), but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Existing school capacity should be sufficient to cope with this level of growth at Wickhambrook. Our earlier comments on the transport implications of this site remain valid.	The comments are noted. Archaeological issues will be dealt with as part of any application for development on the site	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR16015	James Meyer	Suffolk Wildlife Trust				(a) We are currently awaiting the results of an ecological survey of this site. We therefore request that we be allowed to make further comments when we are in receipt of the survey information, this is likely to be by the end of May 2012 (to allow the survey to be carried out during the optimum period).	The results of the SWT survey were received in June 2012.	Additional text has been added to support the policy stating that the site development brief should be produced in consultation with SWT
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21556E	Sian Gilligan	Parish Councillor Withersfield			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21573E	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			yes	Please see full response below in other comments. (see attachment)	The response from Wickhambrook Parish Plan committee is noted.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough					A143 density access and increase	The transport impacts of the strategic sites have been assessed through junction capacity work with areas for improvement identified in the Bury St Edmunds Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				no	If there is a requirement for only 22 houses at Wickhambrook this is being taken up gradually with natural building applications - 5 houses are being built within this boundary now. Apparently the school will not be increased in size so how will it cope with even more pupils?. The road infrastructure is not addressed here as there will be an increase in traffic at Thorns Corner to this new development and subsequent pedestrian traffic to the village shop. Although there are very few accidents plenty of near misses have been witnessed This cross roads is very dangerous for pedestrians and crossing vehicles because of speeding vehicles and a major concern for safety. There must be a calming measure instigated on the B1063 and Cemetery Road to ensure safety of pedestrians and present/future occupants. Increase of traffic noise is again an issue - local residents need to be kept in the loop and given advice on its' reduction.	Infill development occurs in addition to the allocation of development sites in a Local Plan. A transport assessment and safety audit will be required as part of any application for development on the site. Suffolk County Council have stated that the school can support the additional pupils arising from this development	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes	Affordable housing I am concerned that any properties created under the affordable housing requirement aren't just affordable for the first occupants, but also for all future occupants. The importance of affordable rental, or equity-sharing ownership, should be priority to serve families or individuals who can evidence local links; we should protect against one-off discounted sales to individuals who subsequently re-sell the property into the mainstream housing market, at market value, thereby pocketing the purchase subsidy (that associated with affordable homes), whilst at the same time losing permanently the affordable home from the limited number available to individuals/families with local contact.	There will be a requirement for 30% affordable housing on this site.	
	Jon Bell					We continue to question the need to use this land for a new GP Surgery ? Wickhambrook is already home to a large Dispensing Practice, which has been subject to refurbishment within the last few years. The downgrading of proposals that Wickhambrook become a Key Service Centre, so that it remains a Local Service Centre, results in a much reduced requirement to site new homes within the village and surroundings, and therefore the demand on medical services within the village will not be increased hugely. What is the cost, and how much benefit will be achieved, if the existing Surgery in Nunnery Green is moved to an identical facility some 500 metres to the Northwest ?	The Drs surgery serves a much wider area than just Wickhambrook and has indicated a need to expand.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Jon Bell					<p>Should the site have to be chosen for small-scale housing development, we are supportive of a proposal where:</p> <p>a) concept statement and masterplan recognise the concerns of local residents affected by the changes, rather than just those seeking to sell the land to developers.</p> <p>b) Proposers acknowledge that irreversible damage to local wildlife will occur unless hedgerows, trees and meadowland cited in the Greenfield site are protected both for the duration of any construction, and afterwards, and also for periods beyond the 2031 timeline. We took great interest in looking at the December 1945 aerial photographs of the Wickhambrook village, available through Google Earth; the central hedgerow dividing the site into East and West sections is clearly visible on both current and historic views.</p>	<p>The site has been assessed as being medium ecological value by Suffolk Wildlife Trust (June 2012) and a development brief should be produced win consultation with SWT to help identify the developable areas of the site and mitigate any notable species present on the site</p>	<p>Supporting text amended to state that a development brief should be produced win consultation with SWT to help identify the developable areas of the site and mitigate any notable species present on the site</p>

Rural Vision 2031
Question 46: Wickhambrook (RV20)

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 46a - Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?	Question 46b - Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?	Council's Assessment	Action
	Jon Bell					<p>c) Proposers remain sensitive to the separation between the individual Greens that have remained distinct (Coltsfoot, Meeting, Moor, Thorns, Nunnery); it is clear from the historical views shown in Google Earth the risk that insensitive planning on this site will produce a homogenous village with little character being retained. Sensitive landscaping would lessen the impact of high-density development on the site (22 home and another GP surgery IS - by comparison to the rest of the Village - high density development).</p> <p>d) Adequate provision is made for increase in traffic and off-road parking for the new development, and associated safety concerns are addressed.</p>	There is no proposal to consolidate the individual Greens. Parking provision will be dealt with at the planning application stage	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15688	Mr and Mrs J Holmes				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15689	Mrs P. E. Bayman				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15718	Andrea Holmes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15758	Mr Kevin Mixture				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15764	Mrs S A Angel				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15791	Adam Tuck	PlanSurv Ltd	Mr Jason Watson		no	Recognition must be given to the clustered settlement around Wickhambrook and these areas, such as those properties at Wickham Street and the junction with the A143 Bury Road should be included within the housing settlement boundary to acknowledge the contribution that these areas continue to make to the residential accommodation available in the borough. The housing settlement boundary should be redrawn to include all built up areas within the Wickhambrook Parish.	There is a policy in the Joint Development Management Document which permits infill development in settlements without a boundary and in areas of countryside subject to meeting certain requirements.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15815	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon		no	The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (April 2010), which was published alongside the Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document, established that Land north of Bunters Road is the most sustainable option for housing in Wickhambrook. There are no reasons within the updated Sustainability Appraisal (February 2012) (or in the Rural 3 Vision 2031 Preferred Options Document) to confirm why the merits of Land north of Bunters Road have been ignored. In any case, the updated Sustainability Appraisal illustrates that Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill is still less sustainable than Land north of Bunters Road. Therefore Policy RV20, the proposed change to the Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary and the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) are not justified or consistent with national policy and accordingly, those elements are not sound. This representation therefore objects to these elements.	The site at Cemetery Road is considered to be in the most appropriate location in relation to the villages services and facilities and built form.	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon			<p>This representation demonstrates that if the methodology of the updated Sustainability Appraisal was also applied to the two other previous preferred options, Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill would still be no more sustainable than Land south of Bunters Road and less sustainable than Land north of Bunters Road. There are also several other very positive benefits in the allocation of Land north of Bunters Road as a residential development.</p> <p>To make the Rural Vision 2031 sound, we strongly recommend that the following amendments are made to the Rural Vision 2031 Preferred Options Document:</p> <p>1. Land north of Bunters Road should be identified by Policy RV20 as the preferred option for housing in Wickhambrook with a doctors surgery (instead of Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill</p>	See above	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Owen Pike	Cheffins	Mr J Claydon			<p>2. The Housing Settlement Boundary on the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) should be moved to the west of its existing position along the rear gardens of the properties in Boyden Close and follow the existing boundaries of Land north of Bunters Road. This will enable Land north of Bunters Road to be wholly included within the housing settlement boundary.</p> <p>3. The Housing Settlement Boundary on the Wickhambrook Proposals Map (Inset No. 54) should be moved to the west of Cemetery Road and follow the existing north, west and south boundaries of Land at Nunnery Green and Cemetery Hill. This will reflect the current proposals map for the village and preserve the site's position wholly outside the housing settlement boundary.</p> <p>See separate letter for details.</p>	See above	No changes required
RVR15816	John Popham	John Popham Planning	The Bailey Family Trust, The Woollard Family		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15821	Colin Knight	Horringer cum Ickworth Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15826	Sally Fletcher	Januarys Consultant Surveyors	Mr John Barber		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15829	Roger Medley	Wickhambrook Parish Council			yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15840	W Lusty	Savills		Pigeon Investment Management Ltd. (c/o the agent)	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15841	Mrs L Harley	Great Barton Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15843	Robert Sturman	Bidwells		Pigeon (Risby) Limited.	no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15846	Graham Macpherson	Suffolk County Council - Property			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15851	J. Wilson	Grove Farm Stud			yes	Housing Settlement boundary creates high value building land and a high density of housing not in keeping with the rural environment.	Comments noted	No changes required
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			no	The Society agrees with the spatial hierarchy but believes that, where possible, allocations should be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan mechanism to demonstrate full community engagement and support for the strategy adopted in each of the key service centres. The Vision 2031 should be a default position only in cases where the local community does not wish to devise its own strategy or is explicitly supportive of the approach taken in the Vision 2031.	It will be for the local communities to decide whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan.	No changes required
RVR15862	Peter Sanderson	Bardwell Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15863	Anne and Andrew Shaw				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15907	Karol John Drewienkiewicz				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15908	Mrs and Mrs Dubroff				no		No explanation is given to support this objection	No changes required
RVR15910	Mr Clive Narrainen				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR15911	Mr and Mrs D Taylor				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15916	Mrs Lin Rozier				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15921	John Scott				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15923	Mr and Mrs D Bramwell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR15924	A Burnell				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR16007	Michael Schultz	Home Farm Lane (South) and Hardwick Park Gardens Residents Group. In accordance with the Council's request in Item 1.14, page 7 of the Rural Vision 2031 Document, we are submitting a single response authorised by the 107 residents of the Group in a petition and detailed application sent to the Council under cover of a letter dated 28th April 2011. The Bury Area Working Party, to whom this petition was presented on 31st May 2011, instructed officers to include the petition as part of the Vision consultation process. (See attachments in relation to Bury Vision response BVR16021)			no	We object to the Borough being classed as a growth area and do not wish to see the town of Bury St. Edmunds, villages and small towns expanded to the extent proposed. Steps should be taken to review the Core Strategy and reduce the numbers of dwellings to be built. This should be linked to The Visions for Bury and Haverhill.	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

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
	Michael Schultz	This petition relates specifically to Question 20, page 52 of Vision concerning Areas of Special Character, though it has wider implications. This petition links with our submission under 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 the expansion plans for the Borough and we have reflected those concerns in the responses to the various questions posed in the Vision document.					See above	No changes required
RVR16011	Lucy Robinson	Suffolk County Council				The county council has no comment to make on this issue at this time.	The comments are noted	No changes required
RVR20991E	Peter Brindley				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21020E	Paul Cooper	Customer Plus			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21066E	Kevin Collins				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21069E	John Pelling				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21141E	Dale Robertson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21157E	B Ward				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21298E	Woolls				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21452E	Andrew Knibbs				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21469E	Joanne Ince	Risby Parish Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21470E	Joanne Ince	Ousden, Lidgate, Stradishall and Stansfield Parish Councils			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21535E	Silviya Millar				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21540E	Sarah Broughton	St Edmundsbury Borough Council			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21573E	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21661E	Mr S Maddison				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21662E	Peter Turner				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21664E	Mrs S James				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21690E	Carol Williams				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21709E	Mark Geddes				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21720E	Andrew Blenkiron	Euston Estate			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21693E	Mr & Mrs Neil French				no	The change should include the area to the south east of the school - this land may be made available for a doctors surgery and safe parking for the school	This site is not within an identified area of opportunity and there are better located sites for development.	No changes required
RVR21725E	Philip Cobbold	Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy	Mr J Bahar		no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21746E	Emma Gowers				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

Rural Vision 2031
Question 47: Wickhambrook Housing Settlement Boundary

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Question 47a - Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?	Question 47b - If not, please give us your reasons.	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21762E	Jon Bell				yes		This support is welcomed	No changes required
RVR21764E	Dr Jeptepkeny Ronoh	NHS Suffolk			no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				no opinion		Thank you for responding	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15695	Mr R G C Williams				I am amazed that a "Vision" should ignore the community to the East of Barnham village, for whilst it is a short distance from the centre of the village, it does consist of 77 houses and should be included.	This area is former military housing and is located in the countryside with few services and facilities where there is a presumption against further development.	No changes required
RVR15750	Natalie Beal	Breckland District Council			<p>Breckland Council would raise a soundness objection due to the lack of reference to the potential for cross boundary working.</p> <p>In summary, Breckland Council:</p> <p>i Notes that delivery of the actions to meet the aspirations of the document are not clearly stated.</p> <p>ii Notes that there is a lack of delivery, monitoring and implementation framework in the DPD.</p> <p>iii Objects to the DPDs on the grounds of a lack of a policy and monitoring framework on the impact of development in the Borough on protected sites through recreational and urban effects on the Breckland SPA.</p> <p>iv Objects to lack of reference to the potential for cross boundary working.</p> <p>v Requests that the role of Thetford for rural areas to the north of the Borough be fully appreciated; and</p> <p>vi Objects to the preferred approach to residential and employment allocation in Risby as it fails to meet the Core Strategy requirements as proposals are not fully screened.</p>	<p>i. an aspiration and action delivery plan accompanies the document as background evidence. Ii and iii. Appendix 4 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework iv. References have been made to the cross boundary working which has taken place to produce this document. v. The role of Thetford has been acknowledged in those villages to the north of the borough. vi. Additional words have been included in the Risby policy to ensure that a project level HRA is considered at the planning application stage. This is also reflected in the HRA Screening which accompanies the document.</p>	<p>i. an aspiration and action delivery plan accompanies the document as background evidence. Ii and iii. Appendix 4 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework iv. References have been made to the cross boundary working which has taken place to produce this document. v. The role of Thetford has been acknowledged in those villages to the north of the borough. vi. Additional words have been included in the Risby policy to ensure that a project level HRA is considered at the planning application stage. This is also reflected in the HRA Screening which accompanies the document.</p>

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR15860	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			<p>1. I am writing on behalf of the St Edmundsbury District committee of the Society that met to consider the Vision document in the light of discussions with district members. The representations that follow were first circulated to the committee members who were supportive of their scope and content.</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>2. As your records will demonstrate, the Society has consistently questioned the validity of the housing growth figures within the Core Strategy. The Society believes that the drive for growth, unfettered by key economic and environmental constraints (especially employment and water supply) is reckless and unjustified by organic population growth or household formation rates. The Society accepts that household formation rates have changed with a trend towards more numerous, smaller households. Nevertheless in the light of the current protracted economic stagnation and in the absence of the requisite expansion in local employment we believe the ambitious growth in housing is inherently unsustainable and unjustified in our water-stressed county.</p>	The housing requirement in the draft document is based on the evidence available at the time of the Examination into the Core Strategy in 2010. The latest evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 update has demonstrated that projected rate of population growth and associated housing requirement remains valid and should form the basis for the housing allocations in the Vision 2031 documents.	No changes required
	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			<p>3. Furthermore, the phasing of housing growth needs to closely reflect growth in local employment opportunities to prevent commuting and inherently unsustainable trips. The Society believes that there are inadequate demonstrable statistical and economic links between housing growth and employment in the existing framework. This should be addressed by a policy link between employment growth and the phasing of site allocations.</p>	The phasing for residential growth has been amended to make it more flexible which accords with the NPPF.	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Simon Cairns	Suffolk Preservation Society			4. The Society remains fundamentally committed to the delivery of a significantly enhanced supply of affordable homes and homes to meet those with special needs; including the frail elderly. The Vision does not give any encouragement to 'self help' strategies enshrined in the Localism Act; including Community Right to Build and Neighbourhood Development Orders. The Society believes that local Neighbourhoods are best placed to address their needs and that the importance of Neighbourhood Planning needs to be acknowledged in the Vision statements.	Policy RV2 sets out a positive strategy for bringing forward Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders.	No changes required
RVR15992	Adrian and Ann Graves				<p>We write to present our comments and responses to the above consultation documents. These are taken and presented together, not least because we are of the view that the two strategies are inseparable -" and should be reviewed together as a single cohesive approach. Where our comments relate to a specific question in one or other of the documents, these are identified as such.</p> <p>If revisions to some of the settlement boundaries proceed as proposed, then areas of some communities will actually shift from their current status under the Rural Vision to being incorporated within the Bury St. Edmunds Vision. Thus, the two 'Visions' should be considered together at this stage. In the case of Bury St. Edmunds, the proposals for fringe development directly impact on the villages of the Fornhams, Great Barton, Rougham and Westley. In the case of Haverhill, the impact directly affects Withersfield and Little Wrattling, a number of 'Greens' and maybe, even Kedington.</p>	Comments noted	No changes required
	Adrian and Ann Graves				As we are residents of Great Barton, our comments are made in the general context of our commitment to that community and our wish to see the uniqueness of its nature, culture and vibrancy safely protected for the future.	Comments noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves				On the basis of structural considerations alone, the strategy and location of proposed development across Bury St. Edmunds should be reviewed and tested against alternative models. That said, we do recognise the need for growth and the provision of new homes. However, one has only to review the case histories and experiences of towns such as Haverhill to see what can occur when housing development is allowed to proceed before core infrastructure is created in advance to support it. It has taken Haverhill over 40 years to correct the issues presented by inadequate infrastructure, following its expansion as part of London Overspill in the 1960s.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies all of the Vision documents which sets out how the Vision can be delivered.	No changes required
	Adrian and Ann Graves				Finally, we would point to the example of other areas - Cambridgeshire in particular - which have turned to the creation of entirely new communities as a way of meeting future growth and housing need. Cambourne must be regarded as a success and, with the current closer integration of St. Edmundsbury and Forest Heath, a similar rounded community solution could be considered for the area generally around Red Lodge.	The issue of a new settlement was discounted during the production of the Core Strategy which established the strategic areas of growth around Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill.	No changes required
	Adrian and Ann Graves				The area is well served by both the A11 and the A14; it has a railway station (Kennett); it has a large number of brownfield sites and areas of poorly used land; it suffers from the historic departure of American service personnel and it is within easy reach of a sensible number of employment hubs and retail centres. Maybe it offers an alternative model to the currently envisaged, exponential changes to the towns and villages of West Suffolk - which include the irrevocable impact on Bury St. Edmunds and Great Barton in particular.	See above	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Adrian and Ann Graves				The Vision 2031 documents are commendable and we do not underestimate the level of commitment and professionalism that has been shown by those who have sought to create them. However, development on this scale must necessarily be viewed as part of bigger picture regional strategy and indeed, may well thus qualify for support and potential contribution from sources such as the ERDF. Local ambition is laudable - but only where it retains the irreplaceable nature and culture of the historic towns and villages that exist already, together with the vibrant communities they support.	The support is welcomed.	No changes required
RVR16015	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. All maps should be updated to include LNRs where relevant.</p>	Appendix 4 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework. The documents have been updated to reflect the adopted NPPF. National Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites are illustrated on the Policies Map.	Appendix 4 of the Vision sets out a policy monitoring framework. References to NPPF updated.
RVR21104E	Tudor Venn	Hopton cum Knettishall Parish Council			No	Noted	No changes required
RVR21156E	Peter Donoghue				No thanks!	Noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21573E	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>Hollygrove House Shop Hill Wickhambrook Newmarket CB8 8XL</p> <p>Planning Policy Planning & Economic Development Services St Edmundsbury Borough Council West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU</p> <p>April 2012</p> <p>Re: Rural Vision 2031 37 Wickhambrook, Draft Policy RV20</p> <p>The Wickhambrook Parish Plan Steering Committee (WPPSC) was formed in May 2010 with the mission to produce and deliver a questionnaire to survey the residents of Wickhambrook and then analyse the results and issue a final report and action plan.</p>		

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>A four-part questionnaire (Household, Individual, Youth and Business) was delivered to every home (505 households) in the parish during November 2011. Returns were collected from 389 households (a 77% return rate) representing the views of 704 individuals, 81 young people and 33 businesses.</p> <p>Questionnaire responses are currently being analysed and a report is in preparation, however it is unlikely that this work will be completed before your 30 April deadline.</p> <p>Given the high response of Wickhambrook residents to the questionnaire, the committee have endeavoured to extract as much information that relates to the LDF consultation as possible and submit it for your consideration.</p> <p>The deadline for our final report and action plan is late June 2012. We will ensure that you get a copy, in addition to this preliminary information, since there will undoubtedly be many issues raised in it that will have some bearing on the LDF plans for Wickhambrook and their consequences.</p>	Noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>If you have any questions or would like further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Stephen C Sumner (WPPSC Chairman) stephencsumner@hotmail.com</p> <p>cc: Roger Medley (Clerk, Wickhambrook Parish Council) parishclerk@wickhambrook.org</p> <p>The WPPSC survey asked the following questions:</p> <p>Will you need alternative accommodation/housing in Wickhambrook within the next 5 years?</p> <p>The question was answered by 150 individuals (21% of the total number responding). The question offered 5 options. Only one option could be picked or the question could be skipped completely. It is reasonable to assume that the 554 individuals who skipped the question have no alternative housing needs at present. The results in descending order are shown below.</p>	Noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>Smaller home 49 (32.67%) Larger home 46 (30.67%) Starter home 27 (18%) Sheltered/assisted home 21 (14%) Care home 9 (6%)</p> <p>Notes: Smaller and larger home needs are nearly balanced. We did not use the term affordable home since that is hard to define to an audience with varying price needs, but chose starter home instead. There is a significant demand for sheltered/assisted/care accommodation that is not addressed by RV20.</p> <p>In your opinion, what kind of housing development would you like to see in Wickhambrook?</p> <p>This question was answered by 649 individuals (92% of the total number responding). The question offered 7 options and respondents could pick as many answers as they wished. The results in descending order are shown below.</p>	Noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>Conversion of redundant buildings 365 (56.24%) Single homes in controlled locations 264 (40.68%) Small scale housing development (under 35 homes) 197 (30.35%) Filling gaps between individual houses 177 (27.27%) No new housing in Wickhambrook 118 (18.18%) Filling gaps between Greens 49 (7.55%) Large scale development (over 35 homes) 24 (3.7%)</p> <p>Notes: The least popular options (Filling in gaps between greens and Large scale development) are in keeping with LDF proposals 37.3 and 37.4b. The results confirm the majority opinion, expressed in various parts of the questionnaire, that not only the rural nature, but also the exceptional Saxon multiple green layout of Wickhambrook should be preserved. Since the search for development sites began, work has already started on 11 new homes within half a mile of RV20a one on Bunters Rd, two on Cemetery Rd, four in Meeting Green and four behind Wickhambrook Stores.</p>	Noted	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
	Stephen Sumner	Wickhambrook Parish Plan Committee			<p>Other points of interest from the survey</p> <p>77% of respondents identify lack of pavements orcing pedestrians on to the road as a problem. Cemetery Road has no pavement between the RV20a site and the bottom of Cemetery Road in Meeting Green and the top at the village hall. Lack of pavements - forcing pedestrians on to the road</p> <p>603 respondents (92.63%)</p> <p>151 (25.04%) rated this as: 1) Very Serious</p> <p>149 (24.71%) rated this as: 2) Serious</p> <p>166 (27.53%) rated this as: 3) Moderate</p> <p>87 (14.43%) rated this as: 4) Minor</p> <p>50 (8.29%) rated this as: 5) Not a problem</p> <p>Numerous dangerous crossroads and junctions in Wickhambrook were identified. Those at each end of Cemetery Road are of particular relevance to RV20a and were specifically mentioned in comments by residents.</p> <p>Over 80% of respondents identify speeding through the village and speeding on the A143 as a problem.</p> <p>Over 80% of respondents identify roads being too narrow for lorries as a problem.</p> <p>88% of working people in Wickhambrook use a car to get to work. Fewer than 1% use the public bus service.</p>	Noted	No changes required
RVR21626E	Mr and Mrs Kybird				<p>This is too complicated. It puts people of from making a comment too many pages to read complicated language people give up maybe that's the idea. To get a true reflection of peoples views it needed to be better advertised not everyone buys the paper many people are retired and this is to complicated and frightening to complete it takes over a hour without reading. people have not been notified correctly my parents live next door and never received any planning notification that is disgusting.</p>	The advertisement of the consultation went beyond statutory requirements and was in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	No changes required
RVR21638E	Paul Lamplough				<p>ROAD INFRASTRUCTURAL plans to be in-place / working in advance. Common Sence then this might work</p>	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies all of the Vision documents which sets out how the Vision can be delivered.	No changes required

**Rural Vision 2031
Additional Comments**

Reference	Name	Organisation company	Agent Name	Organisation company	Additional Comments	Council's Assessment	Action
RVR21749E	Kathleen Hopper				My main concern is the very large proposed development to the North East of Bury on the A143. Is this really necessary? I accept that there has to be some development, but until there is a by-pass for Great Barton, with all the other proposed developments on the A143 corridor, there is going to be grid lock in and out of Bury. What will have happened to your rural vision then? It would be sensible to improve the infrastructure first.	The site to the North East of Bury St Edmunds was established in the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2010. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanies all of the Vision documents which sets out how the Vision can be delivered.	No changes required
RVR21773E	Eddie Gibson				I support Great Barton Parish Council's efforts to create a Neighbourhood or Parish Plan for the long term development of Great Barton and would like to see this adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.	This support is noted	No changes required