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1. Executive Summary

This report has been prepared in support of the revised Development Brief submitted by Infinity Architects and Strutt and Parker on behalf of the Havebury Housing Partnership and Abbeygate Properties (‘the applicants’), which sets out the principles for developing new homes on allocated land at Erskine Lodge in Great Whelnetham. Consultation has been carried out on the revised Development Brief, which addresses the issues raised by St Edmundsbury Borough Council regarding an initial brief submitted in 2014.

A programme of community consultation was undertaken in September and October 2015 following the submission of the revised Development Brief.

Letters were sent to 252 local residents and copied to key local councillors and the parish council. A comment form was enclosed with the letter, and an online comment form was added to the Havebury Housing Partnership website, along with a copy of the Development Brief.

In response to the consultation, 43 comment forms were returned (either by post, email or via the website). The responses to the closed questions on the comment form were as follows:

- 28% of respondents think the new Development Brief is preferable to the 2014 Development Brief. 30% do not, and 14% are unsure (28% did not provide an answer or stated they had not read the 2014 Development Brief).

- 23% said they support the principles the new Development Brief sets out for the site. 42% said they do not, and 33% are unsure (2% did not provide an answer).

A 17% response rate could be considered average for a consultation of this sort, and shows that the majority of those who were contacted about the proposal did not take part. This could entail a degree of ambivalence or lack of concern towards the development.

All of the responses came from those living in Great Whelnetham or Sicklesmere.
The main issues raised via the comment forms were:

- The potential for an increase in traffic as a result of the development of the site;
- The need for new housing in the local area;
- Perception that the development of the site would be out of character with the village;
- Concern regarding the proposed number of units and density for the site;
- Concern regarding capacity of existing road and education infrastructure;
- Concern regarding planned parking provision;
- Preference for accommodation for the elderly;
- Suggestion that bungalows should be included;
- Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties;
- Concern regarding potential increase in flood risk;
- Concern regarding potential increase in noise;
- Bus services inadequate to support new development;
- Development should be size of Erskine Lodge only;
- Comments regarding building heights;
- The revised Development Brief shows little change from the 2014 Brief; and
- Comments regarding design of homes.

The Development Brief sets out the principles that respond to the key concerns that have been raised. Any future planning application will be required to address these issues, including traffic and transport, flood risk, design and layout, parking provision, and protecting the amenity of existing homes. In terms of local infrastructure, capacity will be reviewed as part of the formal planning process, in consultation with the County Council and Borough Council.

The applicants have carefully considered the feedback received and intend to accommodate the comments as far as possible in any future planning application that is brought forward for the site, should the revised Development Brief be agreed.

On behalf of the applicants, independent consultant Jessica Topham has organised the community consultation and produced this Statement of Community Consultation.
2. Framework for Community Consultation

The following was taken into consideration when agreeing the approach to the consultation for the revised Development Brief.

**Previous consultation**

The consultation exercise for the revised Development Brief builds upon the public engagement process carried out for the original Development Brief in September and October 2014.

An exhibition was held to which local residents, councillors and other stakeholders were invited. This provided an opportunity to view the draft development brief and discuss it with members of the project team. The feedback received during this event and afterwards was taken into consideration when finalising the original development brief.

The findings from this consultation were also carried forward in developing the revised Development Brief.

The key aim at both stages was to facilitate a consultation process that was fair, inclusive and meaningful.

**St Edmundsbury Borough Council’s joint Statement of Community Involvement (adopted February 2014)**

The Council’s SCI states that whilst developers are expected to engage with the community, councillors and other relevant groups, “The form and extent of such engagement(s) will vary depending on the particular proposal but may include one or more of the following:

- Public exhibitions,
- workshops,
- drop-in sessions,
- websites,
- provision of a scale model or computer generated image of the proposal showing how it impacts on the surrounding area,
- public meetings,
- presentations to Town/Parish Councils,
- surveys of local residents/businesses,
• use of local media,”

As detailed above, the original consultation exercise included a number of these methods and has helped to inform the revised Development Brief. The approach for the revised Development Brief built upon this, via letters, feedback forms and websites.

**National Planning Policy Framework**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages applicants to engage with the local community on large development proposals. It states:

“66. Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably.”

---

1 *St Edmundsbury joint Statement of Community Involvement* (February 2014), 2.1, page 19
3. Stakeholders

The views of the Great Whelnetham community are important to the applicants who are committed to undertaking genuine community engagement, both for the Development Brief and any future planning application for the site. The following stakeholders were identified and contacted about the submission of the revised Development Brief and the opportunity for consultation.

Stakeholders

- Residents
252 households and businesses within the direct vicinity of the site were engaged with directly. This ‘consultation zone’ can be seen below.

- Councillors
St Edmundsbury Borough Councillors
  - Cabinet Member for Housing
  - Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth
  - Ward Councillor – Horinger and Whelnetham
  - Sustainable Development Working Party Members

Great Whelnetham Parish Councillors
4. Consultation Activities

The consultation activity sought to inform and update local residents and stakeholders about the revised Development Brief, and invite feedback. This approach built on the earlier consultation exercise, followed best practice methods, and responded to local and national policy requirements.

**Letter to local residents and to stakeholders**
A letter was sent to local residents and businesses in Great Whelnetham to provide an overview of the Development Brief process, detail how the revised version addresses previously raised issues, and to provide details on how the new Brief can be viewed and commented on.

The letter also provided an early introduction to plans to bring forward a planning application for the site in the future.

A copy of this letter was emailed to the key councillors listed in Section 3.

See Appendix 1 for a copy of the letter.

**Comment form**
A comment form was enclosed with each copy of the letter to invite local people to provide feedback on the revised Development Brief. This featured a series of multiple choice and open (free text) questions. Forms could be returned by post or email, and a closing date of 2nd October was given, although forms were received up to 19th October.

See Appendix 2 for a copy of the comment form.

**Web pages**
An overview of the revised Development Brief, along with the comment form and a PDF of the brief itself, was added to the Havebury Housing website.

See Appendix 3 for screen grabs of the web pages.

**Printed copies of the revised Development Brief were also made available in the Sicklesmere Post Office.**
Close of consultation period
The consultation period closed on 2\textsuperscript{nd} October to allow the applicants and Council time to review feedback prior to the revised Development Brief going before the Sustainable Development Working Party. This closing date was stated on all of the above-mentioned consultation materials. However, feedback was received up to the 19\textsuperscript{th} October and this has also been considered in this document.
5. Consultation Feedback

Correspondence received
The primary method for providing feedback during the consultation process was the comment forms posted to local households. Whilst unstructured feedback could also be submitted by email or by post, all 43 responses received were via the comment forms.

Some forms were completed by more than one person per household, and therefore the 43 forms represent the views of 52 individuals.

Feedback
The comment forms included some structured questions and space for ‘free text’ responses. The responses to the closed questions were as follows:

(Percentages have been rounded)

1. Have you read the new Development Brief for the Erskine Lodge site?
   - Yes 40 93%
   - No 2 5%
   - No answer provided 1 2%

2. Do you support the principles the new Development Brief sets out for the site?
   - Yes 10 23%
   - No 18 42%
   - Unsure 14 33%
   - No answer provided 1 2%

3. Do you think the new Development Brief is preferable to the 2014 Development Brief?
   - Yes 12 28%
   - No 13 30%
   - Unsure 6 14%
   - I have not read the 2014 brief 8 19%
   - No answer provided 4 9%
Participants were invited to provide comments to expand on their responses given to Question 2. 39 people chose to do so. The following themes were raised within these comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential increase in traffic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase traffic issues at A134/Stanningfield Road junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for new homes in the local area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Young people need new homes to prevent them from moving out of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elderly need new homes to downsize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Growing population requires more housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that the development of the site would be out of character with the village</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many homes proposed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding the proposed density of the site</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Questions whether 23 houses is the same density as 23 units (as was provided in Erskine Lodge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density is too high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding capacity of road infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing road infrastructure cannot cope with impact of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roundabout is required on A134/Stanningfield Road junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing road infrastructure cannot cope with impact of both phases of development Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding capacity of existing education infrastructure to cope with additional residents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding parking provision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for accommodation for the elderly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Location is better suited to accommodation for the elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accommodation for elderly would result in fewer additional cars on the roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion that bungalows should be included</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bungalows would be more suited to the site setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bungalows would be avoid potential privacy issues for neighbouring properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern regarding loss of privacy for neighbouring homes (general)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern regarding loss of privacy for homes neighbouring the land behind Erskine Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern regarding security of homes neighbouring the land behind Erskine Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential increase in flood risk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential increase in noise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus services inadequate to support new development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should be size of Erskine Lodge only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree principle of providing new homes, with reservations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development would be better located in the town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding proximity to/impact on water treatment plant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of revised density</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of revised suggested layout</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding impact on local residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of revised house designs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes will support village services/facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential impact of building height</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential light pollution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Brief does not meet the Core Strategy objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community facilities means development would be unsustainable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the site relies on use of cars rather than sustainable transport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assurance that those with a local connection will be prioritised in the allocation process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding the closing of Erskine Lodge sheltered accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local need for affordable housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is unsuitable for level of development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief is unrealistic as Havebury do not own the full site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential visual impact of higher density buildings at the front of the site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brief presents no benefits to the village</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of approach to consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust of Havebury Housing, Infinity Architects and the Development Brief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding impact of construction process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erskine Lodge building should not be demolished</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding impact on rent and council taxes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment regarding potential new residents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the bottom of the comment form, participants were invited to provide any further comments. 31 people chose to do so. The following themes were raised in these comments:

Themes already raised to in responses to Question 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference for accommodation for the elderly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local need is for accommodation for the elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local elderly people have been displaced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No provision locally with a warden on call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential flood risk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for new homes in the local area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding potential increase in traffic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment regarding building heights</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Homes should be no taller than existing properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Buildings should not be three storey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding capacity of existing education infrastructure to cope with additional residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of development is inappropriate for the village</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Erskine Lodge part of the site should be developed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree principle of providing new homes, with concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of revised density</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding capacity of road infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding parking provision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree principle of providing new homes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for community infrastructure/facilities is needed | 1
---|---
Need to ensure that those with a local connection will be prioritised in the allocation process | 1
Proposed density is too high | 1
Development would be out of character | 1

Themes not previously referred to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Development brief shows little change from the 2014 Brief</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment regarding design of homes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Request that there are no flat roofs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suggestion that houses should be of a good size and have gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Designs in revised brief are more appealing to look at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding impact on parking situation at school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing can be provided elsewhere (Nowton)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding future development of Fenton’s Farm site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development is for profit only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees should be retained for screening purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Brief is well thought out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding impact of potential objections to development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question regarding possibility to purchase existing council house</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised brief demonstrates local opinion was considered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing footpaths require improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village would benefit from cycle paths</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding use of green buffer to be provided adjacent to water treatment plant as public open space</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of land behind Erskine Lodge will be negatively impacted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of site will ruin the area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query regarding a particular area of land adjacent to site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of site will decrease property value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All feedback received can be found in Appendix 4.
6. Response to Key Themes

The feedback received during the consultation helped the applicants to prioritise the key issues that will be considered when developing any future planning application for the site.

The key themes of the feedback (i.e. comments raised more than three times in consultation responses), and the applicants’ responses to them, can be found below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Applicants’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding increase in traffic at the A134/Stanningfield Road junction as a result of the development of the site</td>
<td>The site is in an accessible location that offers a choice of travel modes and, in particular, access to a range of facilities by foot and cycle. The Development Brief sets out that foot and cycle routes should be included throughout the site to encourage sustainable transport within the immediate locality. Any planning application for the site should be accompanied by a Transport Statement to look at estimated vehicle movements likely to result from a development of this size and to suggest how this can be managed on the road network. If planning permission is received there would may be a legal requirement to provide an appropriate financial contribution to the County Council towards providing any additional capacity that is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for new homes in the local area</td>
<td>The applicants are pleased that local residents recognise the current and growing need for new affordable housing in the local area. This is a key aspiration of the local plan and Rural Vision 2031 document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Young people need new homes to prevent them from moving out of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elderly need new homes to downsize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Growing population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that the development of the site would be <strong>out of character</strong> with the village</td>
<td>The Development Brief states that “it is important that any proposed development respects both the scale of the surrounding properties, the conservation area and the open countryside beyond. Any development proposals brought forward should embrace the particular site constraints and seek to enhance the area by making a positive contribution to the area.” (7.0) Detailed designs for the new homes, including the materials proposed, would be part of any future planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding the proposed <strong>number of homes</strong> and <strong>density</strong> of the site</td>
<td>The density suggested as appropriate in the Development Brief is based on the existing density on the Erskine Lodge site, and a lower density on the land behind, respecting the open countryside beyond. Overall, the Brief suggests a density of 30dph. The existing density of Great Whelnetham village varies from 20 dwellings per hectare to 40 dwellings per hectare. Therefore the density proposed is not out of character with the rest of the village. The Brief suggests around 25 new dwellings could be built on the former Erskine Lodge site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Questions whether 23 houses is the same density as 23 units (as was provided in Erskine Lodge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density is too high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding <strong>capacity of road infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>The site is in an accessible location close to the A134 and the bus route. Any planning application for the site will consult with Suffolk County Council regarding the capacity of the road network and, should planning permission be received, there would may be a legal requirement to provide an appropriate financial contribution towards providing any additional capacity that is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing road infrastructure cannot cope with impact of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roundabout is required on A134/Stanningfield Road junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing road infrastructure cannot cope with impact of both phases of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>development</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Brief sets out that any development on the site “should, as a minimum, meet Silver Building for Life Standards (DPD Policy P22).” (6.11) Therefore elderly residents would not be precluded from living on the site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preference for accommodation for the elderly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concern regarding parking provision</strong> Whilst the Brief states that “parking should not be allowed to dominate spaces” (6.2) it sets out that appropriate car parking provision, in line with Council standards, should be allowed for in any future planning application, according to house numbers and types. The number of spaces to be provided, therefore, would be a matter for any planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestion that bungalows should be included</strong></td>
<td><strong>The exact mix and types of homes for the site are not prescribed in the Development Brief and therefore this would be a consideration for any future planning application.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties</strong> The Brief recognises that “the relationship to, and effect on, the amenity of existing dwellings along the north and east boundaries, and the relationship to their frontage, will be important. Any proposals will need to respect the setting of surrounding buildings, assess it’s impact and not have a detrimental impact on the private amenity of the surrounding dwellings” (3.2, physical Constraints Plan).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Development Brief shows little change from the 2014 Brief</strong> In conjunction with architects, technical advisors and other organisations such as the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, the new Brief has been developed to take into account the Council’s concerns and the comments we received from local people last year, regarding density; potential flood risk; potential impacts on the landscape, local ecology and the conservation area; and proximity to the sewage treatment plant. The new Brief confirms how these matters have been addressed and now suggests that the development of the site should be in two phases, with a different approach for each phase: Phase One: Redevelopment of the Erskine Lodge site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Up to 25 homes | Phase Two: Development of the land behind Erskine Lodge  
| A lower density development of around 35 homes. | The new Development Brief also provides more plans and ideas to show how the above matters have been addressed and to give a clearer indication of how the site should be planned including what the houses should look like. |

| Comment regarding design of homes | The design suggestions received during the consultation are welcomed.  
| Sub-themes | The house designs shown in the revised Development Brief are indicative illustrations only, to demonstrate how the site could be developed at a density of 30dph. |
| - Request that there are no flat roofs |  
| - Suggestion that houses should be of a good size and have gardens |  
| - Designs in revised brief are more appealing to look at |  

<p>| Concern regarding potential increase in flood risk. | Comments were made in reference to flood risk at respondents' individual properties and not with regards to the village as a whole. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be required to support any future planning application, with recommendations included within on how best to manage flood risk in this location. As is detailed in section 6.9 of the Brief, “A sustainable drainage system, replicating the site’s natural drainage, will need to be designed into the development (DPD Policy 5); the main aims will be to: |
| - Reduce flood risk and attenuating runoff |<br />
| - Improve water quality. |<br />
| - Deliver Biodiversity benefits. |<br />
| - Provide Amenity for future occupiers.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern regarding potential increase in <strong>noise</strong></th>
<th>Residential use is not considered as anti-social by Environmental Health.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus services inadequate</strong> to support new development</td>
<td>Consultation will take place with SCC Highways as part of the detailed proposals for this site. This will form part of their discussion and consideration over any requirement for an increased bus service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should be <strong>size</strong> of Erskine Lodge only</td>
<td>Both the Erskine Lodge site and the adjacent land, have been allocated for residential development by St Edmundsbury Borough Council in 2014, in their ‘Rural Area Vision 2031’ site allocation document (which forms part of the St Edmundsbury Local Plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Outcomes

Level of participation
The opportunity for consultation regarding the revised Development Brief was publicised directly to over 250 residents and stakeholders.

43 households provided feedback, representing 17% of the households who were sent a comment form. This shows that 83% of households contacted did not respond to the consultation.

Feedback
In response to the consultation, the main theme of the comments made during the consultation process were:

- The potential for an increase in traffic as a result of the development of the site;
- The need for new housing in the local area;
- Perception that the development of the site would be out of character with the village;
- Concern regarding the proposed number of units and density for the site;
- Concern regarding capacity of existing road and education infrastructure;
- Concern regarding planned parking provision;
- Preference for accommodation for the elderly;
- Suggestion that bungalows should be included;
- Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties;
- Concern regarding potential increase in flood risk;
- Concern regarding potential increase in noise;
- Bus services inadequate to support new development;
- Development should be size of Erskine Lodge only;
- Comments regarding building heights;
- The revised Development Brief shows little change from the 2014 Brief; and
- Comments regarding design of homes.

Almost a third of respondents think that the revised Development Brief is preferable to the 2014 version and, equally, just under a third do not. Whilst 33% of respondents said they are unsure whether or not they support the principles of the revised Brief, 23% said they do, and 42% said they do not.
Outcomes
As the consultation on the revised Development Brief was held after the brief had been finalised and submitted to the Council, the comments received during the consultation period have been fed back to the project team and will be considered when developing a planning application for the site.

Next steps
The applicants will continue to engage with local residents and stakeholders where required and respond to any stakeholder queries throughout the Development Brief process.
APPENDIX 1: LETTER TO LOCAL RESIDENTS

Friday 11th September 2015

Dear Resident,

Building new homes on land at Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham

We are writing to provide you with an update on plans to bring forward proposals for new private and affordable homes on the Erskine Lodge site in Great Whelnetham.

As you may be aware the Erskine Lodge site and the land behind it were both allocated for residential development by St Edmundsbury Borough Council in 2014, in their ‘Rural Area Vision 2031’ site allocation document (which forms part of the St Edmundsbury Local Plan). This means that new homes will be built on this land in the coming years, to help meet housing needs in the local area. The total area for development is just over two hectares but the allocation by the Council does not indicate how many houses should be built on the site.

- New Development Brief – submitted to the Council

Before any new homes can be built on the site, a planning application must be approved by St Edmundsbury Borough Council. However, before we can submit a planning application for consideration, the Council has asked that we produce a ‘Development Brief’ that sets out the density, types of homes, access arrangements, design, and landscaping for the site (but not detailed plans). It is intended that the Brief should be agreed with the Council prior to the determination of any future planning applications.

In 2014, we consulted local residents and stakeholders on an initial Development Brief. Although it was supported by the Council’s planning officers, the Council had some concerns about density and potential flood risk, potential impacts on the landscape, local ecology and the conservation area, and proximity to the sewage treatment plant. Therefore it was not approved.

Over the last few months, we have been working on a new Development Brief with our architects, technical advisors and other organisations such as the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to take into account the Council’s concerns and the comments we received from local people last year.

The new Brief confirms how these matters have been addressed and now suggests that the development of the site should be in two phases, with a different approach for each phase:

Phase One: Redevelopment of the Erskine Lodge site
This is the smaller part of the site (0.7 hectares). Because there are already 23 units on this part of the site, it is considered that it would be suitable for a similar density of around 23 homes.

Phase Two: Development of the land behind Erskine Lodge
This is the larger area of the site (1.4 hectares), which is more suitable for a lower density development of around 55 houses to minimise impacts on neighbouring homes and the countryside beyond.

The new Development Brief also provides more plans and ideas to show how the above matters have been addressed and to give a clearer indication of how the site should be planned including what the houses should look like.
We believe that the new Brief for the Erskine Lodge site has addressed the issues raised and sets out principles for delivering a high quality, appropriate housing development that respects and enhances the village and meets planning policy.

The new Development Brief has now been submitted to the Council and their planning officers will again make a recommendation as to whether it should be adopted. We anticipate that, initially, the Council’s Sustainable Development Working Party will consider it in the autumn, and we are hoping that it will then be adopted by the Council before the end of the year.

If you would like to read the new development Brief, it can be found on our website. If you would like a printed copy please call us on the number below and we will post one to you. Copies are also available at the Post Office. I enclose a feedback form should you wish to provide us with any feedback on the new Development Brief, and you can also send us your comments via the website. Please send us your feedback by Friday 2nd October at midday.

- Planning application – coming soon

Whilst the Council is considering the new Development Brief, we will be starting on the next stage of the process: putting together a planning application for the Erskine Lodge site. We will be holding a public exhibition to share with you our detailed proposals for building new affordable homes on the site, and to invite your feedback, which we will consider before submitting a planning application. We are bringing forward a planning application now to make sure that we can still access the Government funding that we have secured to help us deliver affordable housing on the site.

We will write to you again soon with information about the planning application consultation, providing more details on our proposals and how you can have your say.

At this stage, we would expect the planning application to be determined by the Council some time next year, following the Development Brief process as described above.

In the meantime, I hope this letter has provided you with a useful update - please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Yours faithfully,

Kate Wise
Project Manager
The Havebury Housing Partnership

kate.wise@havebury.com
01284 722049
www.havebury.com/home-ownership/new-homes/great-whelseham/

Encl. Development Brief feedback form

For a printed copy of the Development Brief please visit the Post Office, or call 01284 722248 or email jill.theobald@havebury.com
APPENDIX 2: COMMENT FORM

Erskine Lodge site Development Brief

Comment form

YOUR NAME.................................................................................................................................
YOUR ADDRESS..............................................................................................................................
TELEPHONE/EMAIL.......................................................................................................................  

1. Have you read the new Development Brief for the Erskine Lodge site?
   □ Yes  □ No (go to question 4)

2. Do you support the principles the new Development Brief sets out for the site?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Unsure

Please tell us why:
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................

3. Do you think the new Development Brief is preferable to the 2014 Development Brief?
   □ Yes  □ I have not read the 2014 Development Brief
   □ No  □ Unsure

4. Do you have any further comments?
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................

Please return to: Development Team, Havebury Housing Partnership, Havebury House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 3SP, or email to jili.theobold@havebury.com, by 12pm on Friday 2nd October
ERSKINE LODGE, GREAT WHELNETHAM – DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

New Development Brief – Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham

As you may be aware the Erskine Lodge site and the land behind it were both allocated for residential development by St Edmundsbury Borough Council in 2014, in their ‘Rural Area Vision 2031’ site allocation document (which forms part of the St Edmundsbury Local Plan). This means that new homes will be built on this land in the coming years, to help meet housing needs in the local area. The total area for development is just over two hectares but the allocation by the Council does not indicate how many houses should be built on the site.

Before any new homes can be built on the site, a planning application must be approved by St Edmundsbury Borough Council. However, before we can submit a planning application for consideration, the Council has asked that we produce a Development Brief that sets out the density, types of homes, access arrangements, design, and landscaping for the site (but not detailed plans). It is intended that the Brief should be agreed with the Council prior to the determination of any future planning applications.

In 2014, we consulted local residents and stakeholders on an initial Development Brief. Although it was supported by the Council’s planning officers, the Council had some concerns about density and potential flood risk, potential impacts on the landscape, local ecology and the conservation area, and proximity to the sewage treatment plant.

Therefore it was not approved.

Over the last few months, we have been working on a new Development Brief with Hawesbury, their technical advisors and other organisations such as the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to take into account the Council’s concerns and the comments we received from local people last year.

The new Brief confirms how these matters have been addressed and now suggests that the development of the site should be in two phases, with a different approach for each phase:

Phase One: Redevelopment of the Erskine Lodge Site

This is the smaller part of the site (2.7 hectares). Because there are already 23 units on this part of the site, it is considered that it would be suitable for a similar density of around 23 homes.

Phase Two: Development of the land behind Erskine Lodge

This is the larger area of the site (1.4 hectares), which is more suitable for a lower density development of around 33 houses to minimise impacts on neighbouring homes and the countryside beyond.

The new Development Brief also provides more plans and ideas to show how the above matters have been addressed and to give a clearer indication of how the site should be planned including what the houses should look like.

We believe that the new Brief for the Erskine Lodge site has addressed the issues raised and sets out principles for delivering a high quality, appropriate housing development that respects and enhances the village and meets planning policy.

The new Development Brief has now been submitted to the Council and their planning officers will again make a recommendation as to whether it should be adopted. We anticipate that, initially, the Council’s Sustainable Development Working Party will consider it in the autumn, and we are hoping that it will then be adopted by the Council before the end of the year.

If you would like to read the new Development Brief, it can be downloaded through the link below. Should you wish to provide us with any feedback on the new Development Brief, you can send us your comments via Hawesbury’s website. Alternatively, you can download the comment form and send it to Development Team, Hawesbury Housing Partnership, Hawesbury House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP32 3SR.

Please send your feedback by Friday 2nd October at midday.

Development Brief

Feedback Form
APPENDIX 6: FEEDBACK RECEIVED

Do you support the principles the new Development Brief sets out for the site? Please tell us why:

Distrust of Havebury Housing, Infinity Architects and the Development Brief (1)

- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, ‘it could accommodate around 60’ - ‘around’ being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, ‘will need to’, ‘will be expected to’, ‘where possible’ and ‘this will need to be addressed’. Thus, if your document were to have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as ‘must’ or ‘will’ instead of ‘should’; and ‘essential’ instead of ‘possible’. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton’s Farm site at a time to be decided) purely for building’s sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about ‘affordable homes’, please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you’re already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single storey buildings 23 - and no more.
Supportive of revised density (2)

- The density proposed seems sensible for the size of each phase & the house design is of a more typical standard appearance.
- Less houses - environmental impact (road, school etc) (responded ‘yes’ to support)

Supportive of revised house designs (1)

- The density proposed seems sensible for the size of each phase & the house design is of a more typical standard appearance.

Supportive of revised suggested layout (2)

- The brief on paper appears to be an open attractive ‘uncluttered’ design. However my concern deals with parking. Brief quotes ‘parking should not be allowed to dominate’, ‘limiting parking courts’, ‘not dominated by the car’. This is the 21st century and most adults need transport, regardless of our very efficient bus service. If adequate parking is not provided these property owners will park elsewhere. Stanningfield Road? Hambrok Close? Raynsford Road? Raynsford Road is narrow and I have already encountered on a number of occasions when you are forced across the centre to go around parked cars, particularly at the first right-hand corner on Raynsford Road and you meet on-coming traffic. Please take a walk around the roads of GW at the end of the day and note how many cars are parked within each household. ‘Adequate’ parking is a priority in the 21 Century otherwise your ‘vision’ with [sic] certainly not be achieved.
- No flats from what I could make out as opposed to first brief. Looks well spaced. However would like to see sufficient parking allocation.

Concern regarding traffic (11)

- Traffic!!! 60 homes means at least 45 cars. The junction between Stanningfield Road and the A134 is a nightmare in the mornings. There is an almost continuous stream of traffic from Sudbury making it time consuming and/or dangerous to get out of there. The road is so overloaded that it takes 25 minutes to drive 3 miles. And you want to make it worse. At the very least put a roundabout in at that junction to ease the traffic flow and manage the speed of cars, or better still build a better ‘retirement’ village for the elderly to live in which would then free up the existing homes within the village and keeping the traffic increase to a minimum.
- Has any thought been giving to the increase in traffic, especially in regards to more traffic to the existing junction and it’s proximity from the junction off the main road.
- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is
predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

- Phase one - Erskine Lodge site. Sounds OK replacing 23 units with a ‘similar density’ but could this mean 24, 25 or 26 houses? Few of the previous tenants had cars. New homes would mean more cars joining the A134 which is already congested at that junction.
- The infrastructure at this area will not support further development, in particular the extra burden on the bus service to Bury St Edmunds. We have enough problems at the present time in finding room on the buses at peak times. It will also throw additional burden on extra traffic at the A134/Stanningfield Road junction
- The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

**Objective 3**

Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable

**Objective 4**
To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built-up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)

Reason for failure to meet objective 4

The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built-up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

Objective 5

To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5

This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/other motorised transport will be used.

Objective 6

To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.

The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

Objective 7

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages’ identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of
the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference.

- Unsuitable for overcrowding houses on. Unhygienic for houses to be constructed so close to a sewage works! Traffic congestion is at its limit now. There has already been one fatal accident that I'm aware of.
- I have lived in Sicklesmere 27 years and already the traffic in the area far too busy. Access to my drive blocked most mornings due to parking for shop. Increasing the populus in such a small community can only cause standard of life to decrease.
- Does a small village need this beyond [X] and what will it do to accessing the A134 from our house?
- There is already far too much traffic on the A134 - it’s terrible. Also the noise and trying to get out on the road.
- Traffic on A134 at this junction and at Southgate Roundabout is well overloaded and with the speed of traffic well in excess of the legal limit. It is only a matter of time before a serious incident occurs. Therefore any increase in vehicles at this time is not safe.

Concern regarding road/transport infrastructure (4)

- Traffic!!! 60 homes means at least 45 cars. The junction between Stanningfield Road and the A134 is a nightmare in the mornings. There is an almost continuous stream of traffic from Sudbury making it time consuming and/or dangerous to get out of there. The road is so overloaded that it takes 25 minutes to drive 3 miles. And you want to make it worse. At the very least put a roundabout in at that junction to ease the traffic flow and manage the speed of cars, or better still build a better ‘retirement’ village for the elderly to live in which would then free up the existing homes within the village and keeping the traffic increase to a minimum.
- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief:
  Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level.
  Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families?
  Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc.
  I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property.
  Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.
• 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culmul road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

• Still too many houses for the village amenities if the second phase is implemented e.g. school and transport.

Preference for retirement accommodation (3)

• Traffic!!! 60 homes means at least 45 cars. The junction between Stanningfield Road and the A134 is a nightmare in the mornings. There is an almost continuous stream of traffic from Sudbury making it time consuming and/or dangerous to get out of there. The road is so overloaded that it takes 25 minutes to drive 3 miles. And you want to make it worse. At the very least put a roundabout in at that junction to ease the traffic flow and manage the speed of cars, or better still build a better ‘retirement’ village for the elderly to live in which would then free up the existing homes within the village and keeping the traffic increase to a minimum.

• I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief:
Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level.
Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc.

I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property.

Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.

• 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained.

There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

There is a need for new homes in the local area (6)

• Our young people need houses to stop them leaving the village. We need new people for our church, school and community to survive.
• Because there is a big need for dwellings in the Whelnetham surrounding area, it is about time you started building them instead of wasting money on sending out letters.
• The country’s population is growing, more housing is needed.
• The Erskine Lodge replacement is meeting the present and future needs of the local population and the future development planned across the Sudbury Road (towards the town) 1250 possible houses. The document makes it very clear indeed. Downsizing will be easier for the elderly.
• It’s time that more houses were built in the village for the younger generation and also for older people so that they don’t have to leave the village that they were born in, went to school in and are part of the village community.
• We need more housing for the community especially the youngsters of the village who are in desperate need to get their own place. I have a niece who has been on the housing lost for 10 years. She lives in the village with her parent, she and her partner of several years are now having a baby, as if she waited any more years to get a place, her biological clock would be gone.

Agree principle of providing new homes, with concerns (2)

• We agree that new housing is required, but we are unsure how the new houses that will back onto our house/business will affect us in the future. Security (being a Post Office and Shop with money on the Premises) and Privacy (we have young adults at home with us, and no privacy fencing put up at present) are the main concerns for us really. Lack of light is a worry too if the houses that will be built on the field above the level of our lower floor and back garden, are high in stature. Are there any bungalows planned, and would the back of us be a better place for a bungalow to avoid this?
• 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes I etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it
would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

**New homes will support village services/facilities (1)**

- Our young people need houses to stop them leaving the village. We need new people for our church, school and community to survive.

**Suggestion that bungalows should be included (3)**

- We agree that new housing is required, but we are unsure how the new houses that will back onto our house/business will affect us in the future. Security (being a Post Office and Shop with money on the Premises) and Privacy (we have young adults at home with us, and no privacy fencing put up at present) are the main concerns for us really. Lack of light is a worry too if the houses that will be built on the field above the level of our lower floor and back garden, are high in stature. Are there any bungalows planned, and would the back of us be a better place for a bungalow to avoid this?
- Single storey units (bungalows) we feel would be a better alternative that high-rise flats especially for the people living by the main road who would be overlooked and losing natural daylight by this development.
- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on Stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it
would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

**Concern regarding potential impact of building height (1)**

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.

**Concerns regarding density (4)**

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.

- Don’t know what higher density housing means. Yes there were 23 units in Erskine Lodge single units not 23 houses. Existing residents should all be given the same consideration.

- Phase one - Erskine Lodge site. Sounds OK replacing 23 units with a ‘similar density’ but could this mean 24, 25 or 26 houses? Few of the previous tenants had cars. New homes would mean more cars joining the A134 which is already congested at that junction.

- To put this brief out is unrealistic because Havebury do not own the land for Phase two and may never own it. You are trying to build high density housing on the original Erskine Lodge retirement home site that is not in keeping with the existing properties in the area. This will look an eyesore at the entrance to the village. High density should be at the back of the site not dominating the entrance to the village. Look at your own photos.
Development would be better located in the town (2)

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property
- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to Great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

Concern regarding education infrastructure (4)

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey...
buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.

- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

- Still too many houses for the village amenities if the second phase is implemented e.g. school and transport.

- Future school places. Type of people moving into the new houses. Parking. Increase in rent, council tax. Parking.

Concern regarding flood risk (3)

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey
buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property

• Flooding
• Erskine Lodge site yes, but not new development. Would be flooding in my back garden when it has rained.

Concern regarding noise (3)

• I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property
• There is already far too much traffic on the A134 - it’s terrible. Also the noise and trying to get out on the road.
• It will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of myself and of neighbours by increased noise levels and disturbance on what is a quiet street/road.

Concern regarding light pollution (1)

• I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my
property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.

**Concern regarding loss of privacy/security of neighbouring properties (3)**

- I don’t support the new Development Brief on the basis of my reasons for the previous Development Brief: Replacing a single storey building with two storey buildings will be hugely imposing on the existing properties situated next to the site which are already at least 7ft lower that the existing buildings ground level. Also, the proposed density is way too much. Surely a replacement Care Home for the elderly is more suitable for a quiet rural location. Why not knock down a Care home in the town and replace with flats/housing? Surely that location would offer more facilities for young families? Nothing has been added to the local infrastructure to accommodate such an increase in population ...i.e. roads/school etc. I am still concerned about flood risk and the effect the increase risk of flooding this development may cause my property. Obviously I am also concerned about a general increase in noise/light pollution and loss of privacy to my property.
- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the Cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoil by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.
- We agree that new housing is required, but we are unsure how the new houses that will back onto our house/business will affect us in the future.
Security (being a Post Office and Shop with money on the Premises) and Privacy (we have young adults at home with us, and no privacy fencing put up at present) are the main concerns for us really. Lack of light is a worry too if the houses that will be built on the field above the level of our lower floor and back garden, are high in stature. Are there any bungalows planned, and would the back of us be a better place for a bungalow to avoid this?

**Development Brief does not meet the Core Strategy objectives (1)**

- The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

**Objective 3**

Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable

**Objective 4**

To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)

Reason for failure to meet objective 4

The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

**Objective 5**

To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5

This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/ other motorised transport will be used

**Objective 6**
To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.

The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

Objective 7

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages' identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference.

Lack of community facilities means development would be unsustainable (1)

- The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

Objective 3

Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable

Objective 4

To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)
Reason for failure to meet objective 4

The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

Objective 5

To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5

This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/ other motorised transport will be used.

Objective 6

To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.

The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

Objective 7

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages’ identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures...
are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference.

**Development of the site would be out of character with the village (6)**

- The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

**Objective 3**

Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages.

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable.

**Objective 4**

To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)

Reason for failure to meet objective 4.

The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

**Objective 5**

To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5.

This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/ other motorised transport will be used.

**Objective 6**

To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.
The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

**Objective 7**

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages' identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference.

- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? The bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and
quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

- I think that the development should only be the size of Erskine Lodge. The village cannot cope with all of the houses/accommodation you are planning to build. It will all become the same as your other slum development at Ashwell Road, The Vinefields and Priors. We do not want that in our village.
- To put this brief out is unrealistic because Havebury do not own the land for Phase two and may never own it. You are trying to build high density housing on the original Erskine Lodge retirement home site that is not in keeping with the existing properties in the area. This will look an eyesore at the entrance to the village. High density should be at the back of the site not dominating the entrance to the village. Look at your own photos.
- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, ‘it could accommodate around 60’ - ‘around’ being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, ‘will need to’, ‘will be expected to’, ‘where possible’ and ‘this will need to be addressed’. Thus, if your document were to have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as ‘must’ or ‘will’ instead of ‘should’; and ‘essential’ instead of ‘possible’. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton’s Farm site at a time to be decided) purely for building’s sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about ‘affordable homes’, please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you’re already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received
back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single storey buildings 23 - and no more.

• I am very concerned that the development is going to have too many houses crammed into a small area. Spoiling the ambiance for existing residents who need to be considered with their views and with sensitivity from the developers.

Location of the site relies on use of cars rather than sustainable transport (1)

• The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

Objective 3
Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable

Objective 4
To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)

Reason for failure to meet objective 4
The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

Objective 5
To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5
This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/ other motorised transport will be used.
Objective 6

To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.

The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

Objective 7

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages' identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference

No assurance that those with a local connection will be prioritised in the allocation process (1)

- The development does not meet the core strategy Objectives

Objective 3

Provide a level of development which helps to maintain and enhance the existing base of community, recreation and health services and facilities appropriate to the requirements of individual villages

Reason for failure to meet objective 3. The village has limited recreational facilities, and no community health services, this development will potentially increase the population by over 10% and therefore will become unsustainable

Objective 4
To ensure that any new development is safe and does not compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and improves access to green space and the countryside. (CS:C, D, G, H)

Reason for failure to meet objective 4

The proposed development will introduce a housing estate into the village. This will compromise the natural and built up character, identity and local distinctiveness of the rural area and inhibit access to green space and the countryside.

Objective 5

To ensure development is located on sites well related to the existing settlement, services and facilities, including local employment opportunities, to help reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means. (CS:F)

Reason or failure to meet objective 5

This objective cannot be met due to the constraints of the Bus service. There are no cycle routes between Whelnetham and Bury St Edmunds, and due to the location of various industry centres in the town it is more likely that Car/ other motorised transport will be used.

Objective 6

To support and encourage all means of sustainable and safe rural transport, including community-led transport schemes, public transport improvements, and cycleway and footway improvements. (CS:I)

Reason for failure to meet Objective 6.

The development of an additional 1250 houses further up Sicklesmere Road and the introduction of a link road to the A14 will increase the amount the traffic using the main road. The increase in traffic flow will mean that the main road becomes more dangerous and will limit the opportunity to develop safe footpaths and cycleways. Suffolk County Council may also reduce its investment in rural transport which again decreases the possibility of this objective being achieved with the proposed development.

Objective 7

Achieve an appropriate scale and form of development that meets local needs and maintains the villages’ identities. (CS:C)

The reason for failure to meet objective 7.

The very principle of the size of the development and its location means that this objective cannot be met. There is no assurance that children and others will be offered houses as a priority within the village. The lack of housing for the elderly of
the community also threatens to ensure the continuity of local connections. It is the people that make and maintain the village identity, and therefore the local connections need to be maintained. Havebury should ensure appropriate measures are in place to ensure those seeking homes with a local connection to the village are treated with preference.

Too many homes proposed (5)

- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained.

Too many homes proposed (5)

- There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the culmum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

- We do not believe there is a call for social housing in the Whelnetham area, especially as there us a new development of 1210 houses in Newton coming soon. The new brief will still effect the sewerage plant, the road and local residents. 5 less houses! How about 40 less houses?

- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, ‘it could accommodate around 60’ - ‘around’ being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, ‘will need to’, ‘will be expected to’, ‘where possible’ and ‘this will need to be addressed’. Thus, if your document were to
have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as 'must' or 'will' instead of 'should'; and 'essential' instead of 'possible'. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton's Farm site at a time to be decided) purely for building's sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about 'affordable homes', please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you're already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single storey buildings 23 - and no more.

- I am very concerned that the development is going to have too many houses crammed into a small area. Spoiling the ambiance for existing residents who need to be considered with their views and with sensitivity from the developers.
- Still too many houses for the village amenities if the second phase is implemented e.g. school and transport.

**Concern regarding parking provision (4)**

- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the
A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to great Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses.Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

- The brief on paper appears to be an open attractive 'uncluttered' design. However my concern deals with parking. Brief quotes ‘parking should not be allowed to dominate’, ‘limiting parking courts’, ‘not dominated by the car’. This is the 21st century and most adults need transport, regardless of our very efficient bus service. If adequate parking is not provided these property owners will park elsewhere. Stanningfield Road? Hambrook Close? Raynsford Road? Raynsford Road is narrow and I have already encountered on a number of occasions when you are forced across the centre to go around parked cars, particularly at the first right-hand corner on Raynsford Road and you meet on-coming traffic. Please take a walk around the roads of GW at the end of the day and note how many cars are parked within each household. ‘Adequate’ parking is a priority in the 21 Century otherwise your ‘vision’ with [sic] certainly not be achieved.

- No flats from what I could make out as opposed to first brief. Looks well spaced. However would like to see sufficient parking allocation.

- Future school places. Type of people moving into the new houses. Parking. Increase in rent, council tax. Parking.

**Bus services inadequate to support new development (3)**

- 60 houses for that size site is inappropriate. This could potentially lead to 120+ cars as most households have 2 cars. Most new housing estates do not offer sufficient off road parking; new garages are not big enough to fit a small car let alone a family car. The houses are not in keeping with the village which is predominantly bungalows. Surely the site would make a perfect retirement village; priority being given to those in the village this way freeing up property in the village when the time came for folk who need assisted living. What about the surrounding properties? How can their privacy be maintained. There has already been an increase of approximately 35% of traffic of the
A134, the queue at 8.25am on Monday morning this week was the cullum road roundabout past the turning to Stanningfield road. This coupled with the 1250 houses proposed off sicklesmere road just leads to a logistical nightmare, the infrastructure of the roads into and around the town cannot cope. Where is it proposed the extra children will go to school? Will public transport be increased? the bus service is only hourly this does not suit most peoples needs, the buses out of town do not run late enough into the evening to allow people to catch a bus home from work. The site is to close to the junction of sicklesmere road, there is bound to be problems for the extra cars trying to exit and enter the new housing development and also for the existing villagers joining an ever increasing queue of cars. I suspect if residents are not able to park outside their homes ! etc. they will start parking on stanningfield road or the nearby residential roads as these are not yellow lined and even if they were there is not enough police resource to police illegal parking. The speed at which traffic already travels on Stanningfield road is already above the recommended 30 speed limit. I moved to Whelnetham for peace and quiet, if I wanted to live on an estate I would have stayed in town. Great Whelnetham is a small village unspoilt by the mass building of houses. I feel it would be detrimental to the makeup of the village to introduce unnecessary houses. Whilst I appreciate the need for housing there are more suitable sites around the town.

• The infrastructure at this area will not support further development, in particular the extra burden on the bus service to Bury St Edmunds. We have enough problems at the present time in finding room on the buses at peak times. It will also throw additional burden on extra traffic at the A134/Stanningfield Road junction

• Last Wednesday my husband who has dementia had a hospital appointment at 4 o’clock. We got the bus at the end of Raynsford Road. It was pouring with rain - no shelter so we were wet to start with. After the appointment I tried to phone a taxi - none available until 5:30. Not knowing the times of the buses in the evenings we had to wait at the bus stop. It was pouring with rain and there was no shelter. we waited for one hour and fifteen minutes and were soaked to the skin. When the bus arrived we were packed in like sardines with all the lovely college students and due to a RTA we crawled home wet and miserable. We are both over 80 and it was hard. I fear that with maybe fifty more houses it will only get worse. There are a lot of elderly people who live in this area, some worse than us. To have another bus between times would be a great help. I have to go down town on one bus and return on the next due to my husband’s condition. Since the bus times have changed I only have half an hour to go to the bank and get my shopping. I now don’t have the time for shopping. We all pay the same council tax as the people nearer the town. So I think it would be fair to consider something especially as it could be as many as fifty families moving here.

Concern regarding the closing of Erskine Lodge sheltered accommodation (1)

• I am very disappointed, no disgusted by the ‘lame’ explanation and excuses given for the abolition of Erskine Lodge, home to so many local people over the years - to be replaced by private (affordable!) residences which will only enhance lives of people outside of badly needed accommodation.
No local need for affordable housing (1)

- We do not believe there is a call for social housing in the Whelnetham area, especially as there us a new development of 1210 houses in Nowton coming soon. The new brief will still effect the sewerage plant, the road and local residents. 5 less houses! How about 40 less houses?

Concern regarding proximity/impact on on water treatment plant (2)

- We do not believe there is a call for social housing in the Whelnetham area, especially as there us a new development of 1210 houses in Nowton coming soon. The new brief will still effect the sewerage plant, the road and local residents. 5 less houses! How about 40 less houses?
- Unsuitable for overcrowding houses on. Unhygienic for houses to be constructed so close to a sewage works! Traffic congestion is at its limit now. There has already been one fatal accident that I'm aware of.

Concern regarding impact on local residents (2)

- We do not believe there is a call for social housing in the Whelnetham area, especially as there us a new development of 1210 houses in Nowton coming soon. The new brief will still effect the sewerage plant, the road and local residents. 5 less houses! How about 40 less houses?
- It will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of myself and of neighbours by increased noise levels and disturbance on what is a quiet street/road.

Development should be size of Erskine Lodge only (3)

- I think that the development should only be the size of Erskine Lodge. The village cannot cope with all of the houses/accommodation you are planning to build. It will all become the same as your other slum development at Ashwell Road, The Vinefields and Priors. We do not want that in our village.
- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, 'it could accommodate around 60' - 'around' being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, ‘will need to’, ‘will be expected to’, ‘where possible’ and ‘this will need to be addressed’. Thus, if your document were to have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as 'must' or 'will' instead of 'should'; and 'essential' instead of 'possible'. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and
having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton’s Farm site at a time to be decided purely for building’s sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about ‘affordable homes’, please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you're already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single storey buildings - and no more.

- Erskine Lodge site yes, but not new development. Would be flooding in my back garden when it has rained.

Site is unsuitable for development (1)

- Unsuitable for overcrowding houses on. Unhygienic for houses to be constructed so close to a sewage works! Traffic congestion is at its limit now. There has already been one fatal accident that I'm aware of.

Brief is unrealistic as Havebury do not own the full site (1)

- To put this brief out is unrealistic because Havebury do not own the land for Phase two and may never own it. You are trying to build high density housing on the original Erskine Lodge retirement home site that is not in keeping with the existing properties in the area. This will look an eyesore at the entrance to the village. High density should be at the back of the site not dominating the entrance to the village. Look at your own photos.

Concern regarding visual impact (1)

- To put this brief out is unrealistic because Havebury do not own the land for Phase two and may never own it. You are trying to build high density housing on the original Erskine Lodge retirement home site that is not in keeping with the existing properties in the area. This will look an eyesore at the entrance to
the village. High density should be at the back of the site not dominating the entrance to the village. Look at your own photos.

**New Brief presents no benefits to the village (1)**

- We feel that nothing has changed from the 2014 that would benefit our villages

**Standard of living will decrease (1)**

- I have lived in Sicklesmere 27 years and already the traffic in the area far too busy. Access to my drive blocked most mornings due to parking for shop. Increasing the populus in such a small community can only cause standard of life to decrease.

**No change from the original Development Brief (1)**

- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, ‘it could accommodate around 60’ - ‘around’ being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, ‘will need to’, ‘will be expected to’, ‘where possible’ and ‘this will need to be addressed’. Thus, if your document were to have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as ‘must’ or ‘will’ instead of ‘should’; and ‘essential’ instead of ‘possible’. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton’s Farm site at a time to be decided) purely for building’s sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about ‘affordable homes’, please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you’re already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives.
where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single storey buildings 23 - and no more.

Criticism of approach to consultation (1)

- This latest (September 2015) Development Brief is simply the previous development briefs taken out, dusted down and tarted up. The original number of new dwellings suggested for the Erskine Lodge was 65 - now, 'it could accommodate around 60' - 'around' being one of many weasel words being used in this document which, once again, is couched in terms wide open to accommodate moving the goalposts. Other examples of expressions to facilitate get-out clauses include, 'will need to', 'will be expected to', 'where possible' and 'this will need to be addressed'. Thus, if your document were to have any hope of plausibility, you should be using terms such as 'must' or 'will' instead of 'should'; and 'essential' instead of 'possible'. The problem - and by that, I meant the problem which affects you - is that the residents do not believe one word you say. They do not trust you - or infinity architects - from here to there. In short, amongst the villagers you do not possess any credibility whatsoever. No, it is clear to the residents that your objective is to cram as many sub-standard buildings as possible into the Erskine Lodge site (and having done so, replicate the exercise at the Fenton's Farm site at a time to be decided) purely for building's sake and your own best interests. The result will be to turn the village of Great Whelnetham into a slum extension of the Ashwell Road, the Vinefields and the Priors area of Bury St Edmunds which you already control. Great Whelnetham does not need such a huge rise in the number of new homes; and before you endeavour to play your trump card of whining about 'affordable homes', please note that in the nearby Abbots Vale development in which it is intended that 1,250 new homes will be built, together with a school, playing fields and a centre offering shops and services, it is on that site that there will be a sufficiency of affordable homes. This village does not have the infrastructure to support these extra homes - but you're already aware of that, from the enormous amount of adverse comments and criticism you have already received. It appears you have scheduled a consultative session at the Whelnetham Community Centre on Tuesday 29 September between 1pm-8pm. I have no doubt that this will be the usual shambolic encounter between residents and your representatives where the questions put form concerned residents will be met with answers which are so fatuous, so ridiculous and which are so devoid of any vestiges of common-sense let alone truthfulness that no reliance can be placed upon anything you say. Certainly, no minutes are kept and any feedback received back at Havebury House from your representatives attending the session will be couched in terms which are only acceptable to you. Therefore, if you really are concerned about the feelings of the residents, limit yourself to
replacing the existing site at Erskine Lodge with the same number of single
storey buildings 23 - and no more.

Concern regarding impact of construction process (1)

• Why knock down a perfectly good building to build new? This will create a
lot of mess and upheaval and inconvenience to all in the village.

Erskine Lodge building should not be demolished (1)

• Why knock down a perfectly good building to build new? This will create a
lot of mess and upheaval and inconvenience to all in the village.

Concern regarding impact on rent and council taxes (1)

• Future school places. Type of people moving into the new houses. Parking.
Increase in rent, council tax. Parking.

Comment regarding potential new residents (1)

• Future school places. Type of people moving into the new houses. Parking.
Increase in rent, council tax. Parking.

Any further comments?

Concern regarding potential increase in traffic (3)

• I have lived here for more than twenty one years - the road is a nightmare.
• These developments would have a negative impact on the existing road
junction of Stanningfield and the A134 causing even more delays than
already experienced.
• 23 elderly folk apartments do not equal houses. In vehicle movements,
increasing this again by around 35 houses will cause much more traffic and a
greater degree of flooding during heavy rain.

Agree principle of providing new homes, with concerns (2)

• I am in favour of this development but not at the future expense of the rest of
the village
• I am not against development but the house building must be keep to
sensible numbers and trying to include the mature trees that are thriving in
the area, shielding this development from the existing housing.

Trees should be retained for screening purposes (1)
I am not against development but the house building must be keep to sensible numbers and trying to include the mature trees that are thriving in the area, shielding this development from the existing housing.

**Development Brief is well thought out (1)**

- Well thought out, shall go forward. NIMBY-ism cannot be allowed to stop progress

**Concern regarding impact of potential objections to development (1)**

- Well thought out, shall go forward. NIMBY-ism cannot be allowed to stop progress

**Question regarding possibility to purchase existing council house (1)**

- With the increase in social housing and the cost to build, does it make the existing houses ready to be sold? Can I buy my council house?

**Revised brief demonstrates local opinion was considered (1)**

- The living units - 23 - where [sic] (mainly) single person apartments!! This ‘23’ therefore does NOT equal 23 homes!! Pleasing development - it shows that local voices were heard! So the Council disapproved the original plan!! May the new plan blend well with the village!!

**Existing footpaths require improvements (1)**

- With more houses in the village I would comment that paths in the village need improving to cope with more pedestrians to and from the school, and would also benefit from cycle paths.

**Village would benefit from cycle paths (1)**

- With more houses in the village I would comment that paths in the village need improving to cope with more pedestrians to and from the school, and would also benefit from cycle paths.

**Concern regarding loss of privacy and security of neighbouring properties (2)**

- We moved into our home (and business) in August 2014 so we had not seen the 2014 Development Brief. We were told that building work may happen in the future sometime, but in the field further back. We are really concerned about Security and Privacy at our home/business premises as being a Post Office and Shop we have money on site, but up until now we have not felt
the need to put up a wooden fence between the field and our boundary line. We are now feeling more vulnerable and feel we have no choice but to put up a wooden fence, covering the full boundary on the side of our house facing the field. No doubt we will have to apply for planning permission to erect this fence (change of use to garden land maybe to put up a fence?) This will cost approx. £350 for planning permission, plus the cost of a very long wooden fence is a big concern for us as a new business that needs securing, and as a family home needing privacy. We will invest in a 2nd CCTV camera at our own expense for peace of mind, on the side of the house as the Post Office secure room will need additional coverage. To sum up, security and privacy are our main concerns, which are now causing us some worry, as well as the added expense of securing our property and its contents.

- The layout and numbers are quite clear to understand and hopefully there will not be too many contrary requests. I would like to see the boundaries on the side of the Post Office and other four properties protected by adequate fencing. Nearly all of the young people leave the village because of the lack of affordable housing.

Support revised denisty (2)

- It is certainly preferable in that the proposed number has been slightly reduced from 65 to 58 but still seems too many for the junction of Stanningfield Road and main Bury to Sudbury Road to cope with. The local school cannot cope with any more pupils or the parking by pupils' parents cars.
- The layout and numbers are quite clear to understand and hopefully there will not be too many contrary requests. I would like to see the boundaries on the side of the Post Office and other four properties protected by adequate fencing. Nearly all of the young people leave the village because of the lack of affordable housing.

Concern regarding capacity of road infrastructure (1)

- It is certainly preferable in that the proposed number has been slightly reduced from 65 to 58 but still seems too many for the junction of Stanningfield Road and main Bury to Sudbury Road to cope with. The local school cannot cope with any more pupils or the parking by pupils' parents cars.

Concern regarding capacity of school (2)

- It is certainly preferable in that the proposed number has been slightly reduced from 65 to 58 but still seems too many for the junction of Stanningfield Road and main Bury to Sudbury Road to cope with. The local school cannot cope with any more pupils or the parking by pupils' parents cars.
- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish
Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklesmere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds.

Concern regarding impact on parking situation at school (2)

- It is certainly preferable in that the proposed number has been slightly reduced from 65 to 58 but still seems too many for the junction of Stanningfield Road and main Bury to Sudbury Road to cope with. The local school cannot cope with any more pupils or the parking by pupils' parents cars.
- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklesmere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly,
more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds.

Preference for accommodation for the elderly (5)

- Build a NEW Care Home on the existing site - we have an ageing population that need a retirement facility to replace Erskine Lodge which was cynically and purposely left to biodegrade and eventually close purely for monetary gain.
- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklesmere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds.
- The people originally living in Erskine Lodge were, in the main, all local and who, over the years, moved out of their Council property to give accommodation to the younger generation for which ‘affordable homes’ were just a dream. Yes we’ve moved on since the early days and more people want to buy - the older generation though? Scattered all over the county after working and living in the village they made.
- Your brief does not answer any of the original issues. If you read the papers you will see there is a desperate need for homes for pensioner to downsize to release their 3-4 bedroom homes for younger families to move into. Because of a road and parking spaces needed in your plans to get 23 properties they
will have to be taller than existing buildings and more dense and these plans do not enhance the village entrance.

- I also think that it is very sad that Erskine Lodge has closed and there is nowhere for the older people to go with a warden on call. Obviously the people in charge don’t care - out of site [sic], out of mind.

Little change from 2014 Brief (4)

- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Siclesmere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds

- I cannot see any difference apart from consultation has been done this time, although unless you keep a close eye on the internet or use the local village shop you would not have been aware of the consultation.

- Your brief does not answer any of the original issues. If you read the papers you will see there is a desperate need for homes for pensioner to downsize to release their 3-4 bedroom homes for younger families to move into. Because of a road and parking spaces needed in your plans to get 23 properties they will have to be taller than existing buildings and more dense and these plans do not enhance the village entrance.

- The actual houses are more appealing to look at but we feel this is the only change. I have enclosed a copy of our original reply as we feel there are no significant changes and this all still stands. This brief is vague and flexible and a number of your team kindly told me that’s how it’s supposed to be as it’s only a brief. In fact you are asking for our opinions on nothing and whatever we say you will change and twist. This makes it very difficult to give a reply. There are a number of things on the brief that concern us. The fact you show
a gentle slope to the river when there is a steep drop (or is this your landscaping). The fact you with [sic] to raise the current roof line. Using the saintry [sic] cordon as a family green space when it is not fit for dwellings. The higher risk of flooding now due to the new estate opposite Newton Park. These are just a few of our problems but as this is a brief that is how I will keep it. We look forward to seeing your actual plans so that we can give definite views. Please take this as our objection to this development brief.

**Brief does not show consideration to potential traffic impacts (1)**

- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklemere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced.

  It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds.

**Brief does not show consideration to adequate parking provision (1)**

- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklemere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of
development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds

Level of development is inappropriate for the village (2)

- Apart from the changes to the appearance of the proposed properties nothing has changed. There has been little or no consideration made in respect of reducing the numbers of properties as requested by the Parish Council. Little or no consideration has been given to the impact of more vehicle movements, to road safety, the potential for additional congestion at the junction of Stanningfield Road and Sicklesmere Road, and the impact of traffic movements in to and out of the development at peak times. There is also a potential for additional parking requirements for potentially 120 residents vehicles plus those vehicles that belong to visitors. This level of development is inappropriate to the village and not in keeping with the 2031 Plan. The number of houses should be reduced. It should also be questioned if the village school has the capacity to take additional children, and how older children will be transported to and from schools in Bury St Edmunds if they are outside of the free transport area. There is a tendency for increased school run traffic, which will increase the negative impact that parking outside the village school currently has not only for residents next to the school but also road safety in that area and school route. With respect to 2031 and future housing needs. It is established fact that by 2031 there will be a significant demand for homes for the elderly, more than for that for young families. Havebury needs to focus on meeting these needs now rather focus simply on homes for families, and adaptable housing, especially in rural areas where Havebury is closing sheltered housing schemes. The sheltered complexes in rural areas need to be replaced with more modern complexes in rural areas to ensure older people can remain in their local communities rather than being forced out in to facilities in Bury St Edmunds
- Neither brief is preferable. There isn’t a need for this many social houses in Great Whelnetham. The development of Erskine Lodge site only is perfectly adequate. The village hasn’t got the infrastructure to over develop!
There is a need for new homes in the local area (3)

- The village needs replacement houses for the elderly and affordable homes for the youngsters
- The layout and numbers are quite clear to understand and hopefully there will not be too many contrary requests. I would like to see the boundaries on the side of the Post Office and other four properties protected by adequate fencing. Nearly all of the young people leave the village because of the lack of affordable housing.
- I think some people should move with the times, build them. I have seen the pictures of the new homes which look more in favour that the 2014 ones as I thought they looked awful for our village. I support the need for new housing in all aspects as our future has to be to expand to help the youngsters get housing.

Concern regarding flood risk (4)

- Flooding is still a major concern. When it rains heavy front garden gets flooded now so it will be made worse with extra homes on Erskine Lodge site. Also any houses built should be kept to the same height as existing buildings.
- The actual houses are more appealing to look at but we feel this is the only change. I have enclosed a copy of our original reply as we feel there are no significant changes and this all still stands. This brief is vague and flexible and a number of your team kindly told me that's how it's supposed to be as it's only a brief. In fact you are asking for our opinions on nothing and whatever we say you will change and twist. This makes it very difficult to give a reply. There are a number of things on the brief that concern us, the fact you show a gentle slope to the river when there is a steep drop (or is this your landscaping). The fact you with [sic] to raise the current roof line. Using the saintry [sic] cordon as a family green space when it is not fit for dwellings. The higher risk of flooding now due to the new estate opposite Newton Park. These are just a few of our problems but as this is a brief that is how I will keep it. We look forward to seeing your actual plans so that we can give definite views. Please take this as our objection to this development brief.
- 23 elderly folk apartments do not equal houses. In vehicle movements, increasing this again by around 35 houses will cause much more traffic and a greater degree of flooding during heavy rain.
- Flooding

Building heights (3)

- Flooding is still a major concern. When it rains heavy front garden gets flooded now so it will be made worse with extra homes on Erskine Lodge site. Also any houses built should be kept to the same height as existing buildings.
- No three storey buildings and no flat roofs please.
- Your brief does not answer any of the original issues. If you read the papers you will see there is a desperate need for homes for pensioner to downsize to release their 3-4 bedroom homes for younger families to move into. Because of a road and parking spaces needed in your plans to get 23 properties they
will have to be taller than existing buildings and more dense and these plans do not enhance the village entrance.

Support for community infrastructure/facilities is needed (1)

- Will the ‘developers’ be contributing to the local community to help maintain/improve local amenities in the village, such as the community centre/playing field, which will have potentially more people wishing to access them.

Comment regarding design of homes (4)

- Three storey buildings and no flat roofs please.
- Development should be mainly ‘social housing’ to rent to local people first. Houses should be of a good size and have gardens.
- The actual houses are more appealing to look at but we feel this is the only change. I have enclosed a copy of our original reply as we feel there are no significant changes and this all still stands. This brief is vague and flexible and a number of your team kindly told me that’s how it’s supposed to be as it’s only a brief. In fact you are asking for our opinions on nothing and whatever we say you will change and twist. This makes it very difficult to give a reply. There are a number of things on the brief that concern us. the fact you show a gentle slope to the river when there is a steep drop (or is this your landscaping). The fact you with [sic] to raise the current roof line. Using the saintry [sic] cordon as a family green space when it is not fit for dwellings. The higher risk of flooding now due to the new estate opposite Nowton Park. These are just a few of our problems but as this is a brief that is how I will keep it. We look forward to seeing your actual plans so that we can give definite views. Please take this as our objection to this development brief.
- I think some people should move with the times, build them. I have seen the pictures of the new homes which look more in favour than the 2014 ones as I thought they looked awful for our village. I support the need for new housing in all aspects as our future has to be to expand to help the youngsters get housing.

Need to prioritise local people in allocation of homes (1)

- Development should be mainly ‘social housing’ to rent to local people first. Houses should be of a good size and have gardens.

Affordable housing can be provided elsewhere (1)

- The Abbots Vale development will be a far better option to provide ‘affordable housing’ than our small village! Why you even want to think about putting more homes at Fentons Farm is just beyond belief. It is my belief that you want to cram as many buildings into the area just for profit and your own aims with no regard to the villagers’ opinions.
Concern regarding future development of Fenton's Farm site (1)

- The Abbots Vale development will be a far better option to provide ‘affordable housing’ than our small village! Why you even want to think about putting more homes at Fentons Farm is just beyond belief. It is my belief that you want to cram as many buildings into the area just for profit and your own aims with no regard to the villagers’ opinions.

Development is for profit only (1)

- The Abbots Vale development will be a far better option to provide ‘affordable housing’ than our small village! Why you even want to think about putting more homes at Fentons Farm is just beyond belief. It is my belief that you want to cram as many buildings into the area just for profit and your own aims with no regard to the villagers’ opinions.

Only Erskine Lodge part of the site should be developed (2)

- Develop existing site only. More homes could be placed on this site without the need to destroy further natural landscape. Just take a look at the savings that can be made by not having to pay an ‘enormous’ price for a small agricultural field. Use existing ‘Council’ owned land first.
- Neither brief is preferable. There isn’t a need for this many social houses in Great Whelnetham. The development of Erskine Lodge site only is perfectly adequate. The village hasn’t got the infrastructure to over develop!

Proposed density is too high (1)

- Your brief does not answer any of the original issues. If you read the papers you will see there is a desperate need for homes for pensioner to downsize to release their 3-4 bedroom homes for younger families to move into. Because of a road and parking spaces needed in your plans to get 23 properties they will have to be taller than existing buildings and more dense and these plans do not enhance the village entrance.

Concern regarding use of green buffer to be provided adjacent to water treatment plant as public open space (1)

- The actual houses are more appealing to look at but we feel this is the only change. I have enclosed a copy of our original reply as we feel there are no significant changes and this all still stands. This brief is vague and flexible and a number of your team kindly told me that’s how it’s supposed to be as it’s only a brief. In fact you are asking for our opinions on nothing and whatever we say you will change and twist. This makes it very difficult to give a reply. There are a number of things on the brief that concern us. The fact you show
a gentle slope to the river when there is a steep drop (or is this your landscaping). The fact you wish [sic] to raise the current roof line. Using the saintry [sic] cordon as a family green space when it is not fit for dwellings. The higher risk of flooding now due to the new estate opposite Nowton Park. These are just a few of our problems but as this is a brief that is how I will keep it. We look forward to seeing your actual plans so that we can give definite views. Please take this as our objection to this development brief.

Views of land behind Erskine Lodge will be negatively impacted (1)

- The area adjacent to Lodge is a natural, beautiful view. My house has been designed to benefit from this view which will be decimated and subsequent value of property (mine) will decrease. I have also tended an area of field 3m wide by width of my property for 25+ years and asked that it would be considered in new development, which was ignored. No I do not approve of ruining the area.

Development of site will ruin the area (1)

- The area adjacent to Lodge is a natural, beautiful view. My house has been designed to benefit from this view which will be decimated and subsequent value of property (mine) will decrease. I have also tended an area of field 3m wide by width of my property for 25+ years and asked that it would be considered in new development, which was ignored. No I do not approve of ruining the area.

Query regarding a particular area of land adjacent to site (1)

- The area adjacent to Lodge is a natural, beautiful view. My house has been designed to benefit from this view which will be decimated and subsequent value of property (mine) will decrease. I have also tended an area of field 3m wide by width of my property for 25+ years and asked that it would be considered in new development, which was ignored. No I do not approve of ruining the area.

Development of site will decrease property value (1)

- The area adjacent to Lodge is a natural, beautiful view. My house has been designed to benefit from this view which will be decimated and subsequent value of property (mine) will decrease. I have also tended an area of field 3m wide by width of my property for 25+ years and asked that it would be considered in new development, which was ignored. No I do not approve of ruining the area.

Development would be out of character (1)
• I think the effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood should be considered. I consider the visual impact of building new houses in our village will ruin it. I consider it out of scale and character in terms of the appearance of new builds in the village. People move to villages for a quiet/peaceful environment not to see it develop and increase in population/size.