## Feedback – On the first draft plan (Appendix C).

Collective & collated comments made during the short survey a local resident undertook of the 3 shop keepers/occupants and as many residents as could be found.

Note that ONE Track did not comment as their Manager was away and nobody wanted to comment instead. These are in no specific order.

Comment	Amendments in revised plan
All agree the existing trees are past their sell by date and should be removed.	N/A
2. Their replacement with 9 trees is excessive and too crowded effectively still blocking out the light to both the businesses and flats facing the Square.	7 ornamental birch trees now proposed.
3. The type of tree suggested (Silver Birch and Scots Pine) are totally inappropriate for the environment. There are already Scots Pine at the back of the shops and these cause untold mess and danger to the public including falling/fallen cones & pine needles everywhere causing a slip hazard. What are needed are trees that do not have a low branch capability (to stop climbing) but are relatively sparse in their crowns requiring little or no maintenance.	Pine trees removed.     The ornamental birch trees should not create the problems that currently exist.
4. The cross path effect has been accepted as a good lead through from the 4 entrances/exits to/from the Square.	N/A
5. The bicycle rack in the middle of the Square is considered inappropriate. If one is needed at all, and there are comments as to why, then it should be placed somewhere away from the shops near to the playground entrance or in the car park.	The central features including the cycle stands have all been shifted further back from the shops for maintenance purposes. As well as providing a facility for cyclists the stands will provide a physical deterrent to those who might want to play ball sports in the square.
6. There should be an entrance to the playground from the Square itself and not via a back gate on the reverse side.	Access point into the play area now proposed.

Comment	Amendments in revised plan
7. The use of asphalt (Tarmac) around the outside should be replaced with something more aesthetic as it is a cheap alternative to the existing paving slabs. If Tarmac has to be used perhaps a different colour could be considered?	Tarmac was chosen for its robust nature and ease of future maintenance and ease of matching. The down side to coloured tarmac is: I) cost II) when repairs are required (and there are plenty of services below the proposed tarmac areas) it's more difficult to provide a true match.
8. The use of timber sleepers, some 200mm off the ground, to surround the tree areas is considered inappropriate when it comes to meeting the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.	The use of 200mm high sleepers to define soft planting areas does not contraventions the DDA.  The sleepers are higher than a standard kerb; we are designing the sleepers as boundaries to planting areas so we are not encouraging people into the sleepered areas.
9. In previous discussions with the late Gordon Cox, it was strongly suggested and agreed that the possibility of having tables & chairs provided by "Chippys" during opening hours to provide an "Al Fresco" eating environment during the summer months could attract more customers to the Square. Therefore a suitable area should be allowed for this in front of all 3 shop establishments. This may well require the re-routing of the "cross" walkways which in itself may be more aesthetic.	The proposed design does not prevent Al fresco eating, however, the owner of the chippy would need to obtain the relevant permission/licence to (1) place items outside of his shop and (2) to serve food outside.

Comment	Amendments in revised plan
10. It is imperative that lighting be provided to cover the steps in the north east corner of the Square as well as the car park itself. Currently, due to the replacement of the lighting on Millfields Way with LED lights, the illumination in both of these areas is now non-existent. The former could be solved by placing flood lights along the north edge of the shop building (owned by SEBC) which would illuminate not only the steps but the entire walkway from front to back of the shops. There have been several instances of near misses where people wearing dark clothing walking across the car park are not seen until the last moment.	I accept the concern reviewing the lighting wasn't in the brief we were originally set but subject to costs and happy to broaden the scope if that's what's wanted.
11. All of the seating has been removed from the plan. It is important that seating be provided as these are heavily used by persons walking from the town to the upper Chalkstone estate; particularly the elderly.	Two fixed benches have now been included.
12. The darkness and appearance of the south alleyway leading from the back of the shops to the Square could be enhanced with better lighting and the occasional repainting in white paint.	This falls outside of the scope of this project but will refer it to the property services team for their consideration.
13. Obviously something needs to be done about the ex-Vixen pub but this is well known about. It needs to be mentioned here as constitutes one quarter of the Square.	Again this falls outside of the original scope of this project, it's not a council owned property so we have a very limited remit to be able to change what's there.
14. Questions were also asked about the long term future of the Chalkstone Community Centre now the Leiston Centre seems to have been adopted by the Town Council. Residents felt the Chalkstone community had been abandoned due to only one of the centres being adopted The building is quite drab and does not attract the amount of usage it should do to support its upkeep. This may be because SEBC does not actively market the building for events. Many of the meetings held at the schools and elsewhere could quite easily be held there; perhaps at a lower cost even. This may in turn encourage customers to the businesses in the Square.	Again this falls outside of the scope of this project. SEBC are looking at how/who is best placed to manage these community assets in the future.

Comment	Amendments in revised plan
15. Sergeant Matt Gilbert: I tend to agree with Glenn that bike racks are not a priority in the square, it needs good lighting in the area to prevent any dead spots in the area which could be used for ASB and the like and trees in the area gives a good natural look but not too many as this	The reviewed plan will hopefully address the concern
can cause further issues with lack of natural lighting and extra leaves on the ground in autumn (tree type depending of course.)	The Council have a duty to be led to decise
16. Inspector Peter Ferrie: From my point of view I would be looking to reduce / design out anything that would cause or encourage ASBI'm not a fan of removing seating howeverI've never found that providing seats causes kids to gather and commit ASBso I'm happy from a policing point of view for the seats to be retained for the use of the whole communityI would not worry that seats will act as a magnet for crime / ASB.	The Council have a duty to help design out ASB concerns.  The raised beds should help deter the football and skating in the square which was flagged as an irritation to surrounding neighbours  Some bench seating will be installed.  The Council have not alleged that proving seating is a magnet for crime/ASB.
17. The budget has been set at £35K. I personally would much rather have seen what it would cost to meet community requirements rather than being limited in this way.	As with all our projects we have to start with an indicative budget. Every business will have budgets for activities and projects and the council is no different.  Where a community can really help is to prioritise what they want within a budget – what's most important to them and what are they prepared to wait for until money is available (or perhaps do some fund raising themselves to add value to their community).