

Appendix 1

The following is a summary of the letters of representation received in respect of this matter:

- The whole village has been built in and around over the last 50 years, desecrating the village.
- More cars will be trying to park around the village, as no one walks anywhere.
- The proposed development is only one of many 'ear marked'.
- The increase of traffic on the B1070, approaching the most dangerous junction on the A12.
- Small infills are all that is required in the village.
- The application pre-empts the Local Neighbourhood Plan
- Our wildlife is being driven out by all the building in the village.
- Our garden pond has great crested newts in it.
- This is completely against the Neighbourhood Plan that the residents of the village completed.
- East Bergholt Surgery cannot cope with the numbers of people in and around the village now. An extra 300 residents will mean the surgery cannot cope.
- One has to presume that there could also be another 300 more cars on the village's roads.
- Parking is already a problem around the shop/post office and the immediate core area of the village. Further vehicles will exacerbate this situation.
- New residents would take advantage of the facilities in the village but would find them too far to walk so would use their car.
- That many more people and cars is not viable for the safety of road users and pedestrians.
- There are areas of public highway between the site and the village core which don't have pavements. This will lead to more accidents.
- Remember that it is a village.
- It would be overpowering.
- The slip road onto the A12 northbound and the two slip roads on the A12 southbound have poor visibility and a very short run-in onto the A12 and are some of the most dangerous entries onto an A-road that I have ever experienced. This development will exacerbate their use and make the likelihood of an accident even worse.
- It is completely out of proportion to the size of the village.
- There is no need/demand for business premises in East Bergholt. The Gattinetts has plenty of vacant units if someone needed one.
- There is no village need for the amount of housing proposed.
- Arable farmland is a strategic resource and should be protected. The loss of hundreds of tons of food for housing that is not needed is frankly criminal.
- East Bergholt is a successful community, why spoil it?
- Roads within the village are grossly inadequate.
- The dangerous access to the proposed site is will cause traffic delays/jams that is already overused as a through road. This is especially the case when the A12 is blocked.
- The village facilities are at breaking point and totally inadequate to handle a 500+ influx.
- The loss of habitat for barn owls and bats should be protected, not destroyed.
- At the local presentation we were assured by the developer that the A12/B1070 junction would be made more safe for an application to proceed. However, now due to some spurious opinion by some not fit to hold office, this is now not so.
- Has witnessed accidents and also had a near miss on the poor A12 junctions.

- An 18% increase in the population of our village is totally unacceptable and disproportionate in size.
- This would be a ruination of outstanding views in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- The core of the village is not within the recognised walking distance of the village centre facilities, as per planning policies.
- The doctors surgery is already under special measures, and has no capacity. You can't get an appointment as it is.
- The need for housing in the village is based on out of date data and no local information was sought by the developers.
- As a now extinct Roman Road passes through the village, it will be necessary to have an archaeological survey carried out.
- East Bergholt is a truly beautiful village. Development of this size is completely out of place.
- East Bergholt is not the right location for such a large number of affordable homes.
- Building 144 houses over such a short period will have a negative impact on the life of the village.
- Supports the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan for small developments of upto 15 dwellings.
- A 20% increase of cars in the centre of the village will have a negative impact.
- East Bergholt is a heritage village. We are proud of our historical links and welcome tourism which is an integral part of our sustainability as a village. Driving past the proposed urban development can only detract from the tourist experience.
- I am appalled to see that some of the drives of the proposed houses are right onto the B1070. Some vehicles will inevitably want to reverse onto the road causing further dangers.
- Would not wish to see this idyllic village become a much unwanted town.
- Many of the villagers chose East Bergholt as their ideal place to enjoy their retirement years. They probably hated having to live and work in an overgrown township.
- It is often difficult to join the B1070 from Foxhall Fields, more cars would lead to needless queuing to exit Foxhall Fields. What next? Traffic lights?
- The people of East Bergholt are absolutely united in expressing their abhorrence at this attempt to disfigure our gloriously landscaped village.
- Are not against development in the village if it is moderate growth.
- Accessing the B1070 from the proposed development would be very dangerous.
- The visibility along this stretch of road would be negatively affected by new bus stops and would increase the risk of accidents.
- It is wrong to assume that a low level of employment exists in this area and there is certainly no need for the new development to increase that level of employment.
- The impact on local shops and transport would be vast.
- Wildlife surveys will be required.
- There are no cycle paths in the village.
- Knights/Bidwells should have to pay for the reconstruction of the A12 junction as a condition of the build. The large cost should not be the responsibility of the local ratepayers.
- Development must not be dumped in one spot. A number of developments could be spread around the village with far less impact than this proposed mass housing site.

- If mass building is needed then this should be sited a mile north of East Bergholt on the east side of the A12 opposite Capel St Mary. This area has already been swamped and spoiled on the west side by mass housing, and access to the A12 would be much safer.
- If Knights/Bidwells were made to pay for the A12 junction reconstruction then they might choose to move their development to Capel St Mary where the infrastructure is already in place.
- John Constable made the village famous, as local planners it should be your duty to protect us from this type of ill-considered mass housing development.
- Even if the planning committee are minded to approve the application, the design is flawed and should be reworked.
- The village is unique in that it successfully combines a vibrant community with a traditional heritage that attracts large numbers of tourists. The sustainability of the community is threatened by a development that is disproportionate to the core village, badly located and with an inappropriate design, all of which threatens the community and future employment in the village.
- Support the view that ongoing development in the village is not only inevitable but positive. There have been several new homes built since I have been in the village.
- The speed at which the development would occur would not allow residents to integrate into the community and they will inevitably develop a new community on the estate.
- The residents in Beehive Close drive to the village centre as it is too far to walk.
- The archaeologists on site were not aware of aerial photographs and local finds.
- The Heritage England Record (HER) for Suffolk is very out of date. As a result, any report which relies on the HER as a source must be viewed with great suspicion. It lacks hundreds of prehistoric finds which I have reported to the Archaeological Unit over the last several years as well as other local reported finds.
- I have field walked and metal detected on land adjacent this site and have found solid evidence of prehistoric settlement.
- The northern boundary of the site is a paleo river, clearly visible on aerial photography. There is no reason to believe that prehistoric activity is confined to the northern boundary.
- The aerial photographs show some very interesting crop marks on the Moores Lane fields.
- The local farmer showed me evidence of a fabulous Mesolithic tranchet axe, possibly 12,000 years old, which was found several years ago on the Moores Lane site. This is a ritual object, carefully placed in a sacred place.
- These finds would not have been in Rachel Abrahams report when she sent it to you.
- It is essential that further exploration trenching is carried out in the area to the north of the Hadleigh Road line before any decision is made on the planning application. If prehistoric evidence is found, the development should be modified to protect it.
- Planting trees to the north would be dreadful from an archaeological point of view – tree root damage can cause as much damage as digging foundations.
- Dated prehistoric, or possible prehistoric, finds were found from top to bottom of the eastern of the two development fields, plus on trench on the west field.
- Metal detecting was done past the Hadleigh Road line, but this has not been reported. Questions what was found there? That area is potentially very sensitive.
- The manner in which the trenching was carried out would have meant they would have missed any non-metallic finds, including more prehistoric pottery.

- The fragment of Bronze Age metal work found is very interesting. The trenching had a 90% chance of missing a hoard.
- The report has not, in any way, ruled out prehistoric settlement on the site. Considers that there is an excellent chance that the investigation missed important evidence of a settlement.
- The process is not designed to pick up traces of prehistoric settlement, which are very hard to find.
- Does not have confidence that the investigation has ruled out the discovery of an important prehistoric settlement.
- Does not believe that the various amendments made to the scheme have improved the proposed development in any significant way or made it more acceptable.
- Hopes that the Council will listen to the people of the village and reject the application.
- The B1070 and Gaston Street junction is undoubtedly the most dangerous junction in the village.
- Babergh's own data shows the high average speeds on this road, and with planned housing developments in and around the village, these problems can only worsen. And now 8 new accesses are proposed, Babergh would be irresponsible approving this application.
- The development would be phased over 5 years, meaning this would be an ongoing development site and would clearly blight the entrance to this conservation village centre for an unacceptable period.
- The Neighbourhood Plan has received the wholehearted support of a significant majority of villagers, and approval of the subject planning application would prevent the needs to the villagers being implemented.
- It is hoped the advanced stage of the NDP will encourage the Planning Committee to recognise the support our plan is receiving and allow sustainable development to proceed in the manner prescribed. To do otherwise would be a dereliction of the Council's public responsibility to "localism" and would most certainly lead to a successful appeal.
- In light of the recent flooding at Hemsby, where there was no river overflowing to cause the flood, may I ask how Anglian Water propose to prevent this happening again? Not only in East Bergholt, but in any area where mass housing is proposed.
- The fields next to Moores Lane are already saturated, may I ask how water is going to be drained away please? This is just one small point to be addressed before plans are passed.
- In reference to the proposed highway improvement plans, particularly the section of the B1070 between Gaston Street and Quintons Road, the developer has shown a section of road that is reduced to 6.0m to provide an increased footway of 1.0m. HS2 Rural Road Design Criteria states that minimum widths for rural roads where buses and HGVs are likely to pass should be 6.8m. There are 56 school bus movements a day along this section of road when schoolchildren are also using the footway as well as other buses. Notwithstanding this, in his initial response, Mr Pearce has requested 6.5m, as well as a footway of 1.5m.
- The developer is unable to achieve the criteria established by HS2 or Suffolk Highways.
- The developer has not shown how he can use any safe cycling route to Manningtree Station without significant off site work, and has so far ignored this problem.
- The High School have discouraged children from cycling because of the dangers of the B1070.

- The existing and proposed position of bus stops is clearly contrary to the Government “Bus Stop Design Guide” and has traffic safety implications which will be exacerbated by introducing a new access to housing and business area. Pedestrians standing at or near the bus stop will obstruct visibility.
- The Road Safety Audit has not addressed the location of the junction, pedestrian crossing and bus stops, and should be considered before planning is granted.
- Mr Pearce requires a pre-commencement condition relating to the footway improvement schemes, but the developer cannot achieve this using the criteria established by Mr Pearce or HS2. On this basis this development should not receive planning approval.
- The development is in the wrong place and is disproportionate unless it can overcome the serious safety issues posed which it has so far failed to do.
- The reduction of the road to 6m will not allow buses or agricultural machinery to pass safely.
- The High Street is an accident waiting to happen already, without further influx of cars by this massive estate.
- The standard of the architecture is well below standard and the RIBA should be further consulted on this.
- There is another application in Hadleigh Road for 10 dwellings which I shall support as it follows the recommendations of our Neighbourhood Plan where residents asked for smaller sites of 10-15 properties.
- Provides photographs of a tractor driving past the school and taking up more than one carriageway on the corner where the plan is to narrow the road.
- Provides details of an exchange of communication they have had directly with SCC Archaeological Service regarding the prehistoric interest in the site and the HER.
- The additional information does not change the fact the application should be rejected as it does not meet the requirements set out in the relevant rules and regulations issued by Babergh DC. In fact, the road changes would make an already dangerous situation worse.
- The additional information fails to address any of the many deficits/errors and gaps in the application. In particular, it fails to deal with the question of local need as clarified in policy CS11.
- The SPD clearly requires that the local needs statements should be prepared using evidence from a variety of sources; the applicant has used none.
- The new LVIA does not give any detail to allow any assessment of the suggested measures.
- The applicant could have revised the layout plans showing the plot boundaries after changing the location of the hedging which is to be removed.
- The Landscape Strategy is nothing other than some high-level suggestions and ideas but nothing conclusive as it was designed for an outline application only. This is unacceptable for an application for full planning permission and of this size and impact.
- The LVIA changes the significance from ‘insignificant’ to ‘Medium to Low’ which is a significant change, which justifies a refusal of permission as all other documents reference the old LVIA.
- The only conclusion which can be drawn is that the applicant does not intend to change the plot boundaries which in effect means that these will become a matter for each individual owner and cannot ensure long term viability of any planting or ensuring that planting meets the local environment.
- This means that effective screening will not exist and the development will be ‘in your face’ from all directions and detrimental.

- The development still does not meet the criteria in policy CS11 and other core strategies.
- The shape of the proposed development does not fit in with the curvature of the village boundary created by Hadleigh Road – the north east corner sticks out like a sore thumb.
- The applicant could have carried out a local needs assessment but has not. I have heard that a survey was carried out on their behalf but this doesn't appear in the documentation. This did not capture all residents as many I have spoken to were not contacted. Can only surmise the findings were the same as those in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Section 22 of CS11 confirms that the Council will give weight to the findings of Neighbourhood Plans where they have been through a robust process of community engagement. The P34 report supports this.
- The survey carried out in support of the NP are clear that 87% of the village support smaller size developments only.
- The Soil report is a desktop analysis with no local relevance, and incorrectly states the application site area.
- Questions a number of areas of the soil report, including the yield calculations, and disagrees that this is a small area, being that this represents an increase of 20%. The report is flawed as the base information is wrong.
- There will not be any of the promised employment as the units will never be built.
- There will be pressure around the development from staff cars, vans or visiting customers due to parking only being just adequate.
- The application should be refused as no local needs have been demonstrated.
- The failure to put the application before the RIBA panel is a glaring omission.
- A multi-million project demands more care and attention from an allegedly 'competent developer' but at least an applicant should comply with the applicable rules and this one hasn't.
- The Road Safety Audit is inadequate and full of gaps, it was undertaken outside rush hour and ignores the five additional accesses onto the B1070. It does not address the proximity of Foxhall Fields, Moores Lane, Beehive Close, the uncontrolled crossing and bus stops.
- The narrower roads will not aid the situation, particularly when the big developments proposed at Brantham and Manningtree/Lawford are completed.
- The applicant has ignored the recommendation of the safety expert in respect of the Gaston End/Gaston Street junction, and proposed a cheaper solution. The visibility here will not be improved and safety is reduced.
- The scope of the RSA was too narrow and should have looked at all roads in and out of the village and connected to the application site, the lack of pavements and the blight from higher traffic volumes.
- The applicant should commit to building a cycle track to Manningtree.
- The failure to properly address all significant road safety issues is sufficient to justify refusal of the application. Ignoring these would be nothing short of gross negligence.
- The house we live in was built by Knight Developments and is not of a high standard and it took them longer than 12 months to build 6 houses in Beehive Close or 4 at High Trees Farm. Questions how they will manage to build 44 or 50 in a year, which can only be achieved by cutting corners.
- The houses will not be sustainable as they will not last as long as some of the houses in the village.
- The application is contradictory as it states the speed of building will be dictated by demand. What is it to be?

- The mitigation measures are non-committal.
- It is unlikely that the landscape integration will improve over time.
- The applicant should be asked if there is a change in control which would create a risk that a different strategy would be pursued and mitigation measures will no longer be relevant.
- There is no comprehensive or conclusive flood risk assessment or mitigation. The proposed swamp is not the answer.
- The applicant uses information from the Neighbourhood Plan and hence they accept the methodologies in it. Consequently all results need to be taken into account and this means refusal as there is no need for 144 dwellings in East Bergholt.
- Permission should be refused now more than ever on grounds of prematurity.
- There is no detail whatsoever dealing with light pollution emanating from the development.
- The improvements proposed should all be part of the conditions (s106) should the Council still believe that the application is approvable, and paid for by the applicant. They stand to make millions from the scheme.
- Disappointed that the applicant has not taken the chance to reduce the scale of the development.
- The application fails to satisfy Para 4 of the SPD, in that it does not evidence compliance with all the criteria set out in Policy CS11.
- The LVIA contains an aerial photograph that is still some years out of date.
- Questions the extent to which there has been ongoing dialogue between the applicant's agent and the Council.
- Disappointing that no detailed landscaping proposal has been submitted to help judge the extent to which the external visual detractors might be minimised. The applicant admits at para. 6.1 that it is not possible to predict the impact on the landscape and the views from nearby receptors.
- The LVIA fails to identify the location of two nearby ponds in close proximity to the site. We have expressed our concern about potential groundwater drainage into our pond but have seen no comments from GEMCO or anyone else.
- The LVIA incorrectly details how many properties are served off Moores Lane.
- The LVIA is totally biased and not fit for purpose, it claims that the impact from the A12 would be insignificant when 144 dwellings and commercial buildings would be prominent in the landscape.
- The LVIA totally ignores the impact from the A12.
- There is no mention of when the landscape planting would be carried out. If permission is granted this should be conditional that planting is put in at the outset and not in five years time.
- Fenn Wright are hardly likely to portray the business units as anything other than positive, as they stand to benefit from marketing them in due course. They state n that demand for this type of accommodation is only reasonable and that 14 car parking spaces is only just adequate.
- Fenn Wright refer to schemes at Holton Park and Dedham where units are vacant, but fail to mention two other competing schemes in East Bergholt at The Gattinets and at Wheelers Yard. Perhaps they have failed to mention these because they have vacant units indicating there is no demand.
- A prominent advertising board will be displayed during the forecast 12 months marketing period, which would be most unwelcome. The frontage would undoubtedly also be festooned with advertising hoardings for up to five years, not exactly in keeping with Constable Country.

- Instead of commercial space, this space would be better utilised left open to give depth to the suggested village green concept which otherwise is nothing more than a linear verge.
- The removal of the grassed island at the junction with Gaston Street is objectionable, as it is part of the rural village environment.
- It has become obvious that the application is an exercise designed to enhance the asset value of the land for ruthless commercial gain. The national housing shortage and financial rewards appear to be the means to try and persuade your Planning Committee to approve an application that up until two years ago would have stood no chance of success.
- The decision to refuse permission would bring no discredit to the Council's reputation and desire to contribute to the national demand for new housing given the large scale of other major windfall developments materialising in the district in recent months.
- The High School, Medical Centre and garage have considerable traffic from visiting vehicles.
- The speed and volume of traffic on the B1070 has already turned this road into a race track, added to by the commuter traffic from Hadleigh.
- The road improvements will improve safety for some and increase danger for others.
- Believes that this will become an accident blackspot.
- Believes that the applicant should withdraw the application and submit a new one due to the amount of superseded and replacement information. This would be clearer and consistent.
- The admirable attempts to overcome a major safety issue would not be necessary if we were considering a small scale development.
- I have yet to hear a favourable comment for this scheme.
- A quick appraisal of the village indicates that it is ribbon development, both within the village and in East End.
- The erection of 144 dwellings is both inappropriate and detrimental for the continuing development of the community.
- I trust the strength of public opinion is clearly comprehended by the officers of the Council, as well as the members of the Committee and the Council as a whole. If local opinion is ignored, it will result in a serious breach of trust in the elected members.
- Acknowledges that there is a need to provide additional housing within and for those who wish to live here, but an increase in 17% in a single development will fundamentally change the nature and expectations of the inhabitants.
- Any proposal which undermines the basic principle, that the key features of village life is the need to provide a framework for all people to engage in as many interests that can be provided by both the Parish Council as well as churches and other organisations. will be a disaster for all concerned.
- This development would change the approach to the village from looking like a country village to looking like a suburb next to a dual carriageway.
- The applicant has appointed very capable professionals to argue his case and they have made the very best of a dauntingly weak case. However, the manner in which representations from objectors are displayed on the website reduces their impact. Consequently, the impression is given that the objectors are a bunch of illiterate idiots in comparison. It is unacceptable for the Council to promote such bias.
- The green rural entry into our village will be destroyed, the hedge removed and the substantial oak to be removed is vandalism on a grand scale.
- Thanks to Suffolk Highways intervention, we shall have entry into the village that would be appropriate for a small town.

- Please ensure that, if passed, there is sufficient land available to create a landscape scheme that will restore and enhance our green entry to the village.
- Would East Bergholt remain as a village as most people want?
- We do not need any more shops.
- We are not happy with the removal of trees to improve visibility for cars and a path on Foxhall Fields side would be problematic due to ditch and trees.
- We do not want the village to end up like Capel which is just a series of large housing estates.
- The hedgerow is to be removed, but the response from Public Realm says the hedgerows should be protected. Another discrepancy contributing to the long list of reasons why this should be refused.
- It cannot be argued that the loss of hedgerow and mature Oak tree is consistent with a requirement that any development is in keeping with and sensitive to its setting. The revised plans do not suggest that the hedgerow and/or trees will be resited further away from the B1070 which is unacceptable. It will result in the loss of a wildlife corridor and an important visual amenity.
- The proposed traffic calming measures do not effectively reduce speed of traffic entering the village along the B1070. It is hard to envisage that a stretch of coloured roadway and/or the addition of a white picket fence will achieve that effect on a road which has the feel of a wide, main road through the village.
- No evidence has been submitted that these measures will be effective.
- Questions whether a white picket fence is the appropriate material for such a gateway. This will urbanise the approach to the village and materially detract from the rural entrance to the village.
- Who will be responsible for the upkeep of the picket fence? Residents?
- The speed limit should be reduced to 20mph throughout the village.
- This is a quasi urban development being imposed on a rural landscape.
- The proposal to use valuable agricultural for low cost housing, far from the centre of the village, will create a separate community for those on lower incomes.
- Older residents need to be close to the centre of the village but only large expensive houses have been built close to these. These luxurious homes have multiple garages.
- The rules concerning visibility splays state that any obstruction must be less than 1.005m in height. This means that almost 200 metres to the frontage of the proposed disproportionate development will be forever open and unsightly.
- The bus stop position is dangerous and unsafe and will build up traffic back to the dangerous A12 slip road.
- We live in rural Suffolk not some twee Disneyfield environment.
- The one shop/post office carries a minimal amount of stock and is not within walking distance.
- The design of this estate is to provide affordable housing for local people but once again we see large houses included.
- The design resembles a rabbit warren, the layout is abysmal with little consideration for access for emergency vehicles.
- With the loss of green belt implicit in this proposal comes loss of habitat, mature trees and hedgerow threatening many wildlife inhabitants of the area.
- No wildlife survey has been carried out.
- Aesthetically out of character with a rural Suffolk identity such a development presents us with visually clouded landscapes.
- Objects to the canvassing activities being undertaken by the applicant or others acting on their behalf. The motives behind this are suspect, especially if the data is used by the applicant to counter the numerous objections.

- Granting permission would undermine the Neighbourhood Plan process and be contrary to the NPPF, where the first core principle says that planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.
- Conflicts with the NPPG in respect of prematurity and should therefore be refused.
- The responses of residents to the NP are clearly a material consideration to which the Council should place considerable weight in determining this application.
- The proposed development is unsustainable because of the conflict with the emerging NP and the unacceptable impact of the scheme. These factors significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits in terms of its contribution to providing housing in the area, even if a need were established.
- The new development is a stretch too far.
- The schools are pretty much full and new schools built will take up more land and resources.
- I totally agree with all the objections in the Action East Bergholt pamphlet.
- The development of this size does not increase any employment in the area.
- There is clearly more suitable land for this size of development in north Essex.
- The proposed development does not take into account developments on other sites earmarked in the SHLAA.
- The only people that would gain from this would be the developers and everyone who loves the village, lives there and visitors would be the losers.
- Over their lifetime in the village (86 years) they have seen the development of Foxhall Fields, Chaplins Road, Richardsons Road, Collingwood Fields, Whitesfield, Aldous Close and Notcutts.
- The transport infrastructure cannot support the additional people it would generate.
- There are already no seats available on trains from Manningtree to Liverpool Street. What assurances does the committee have from Abellio that there will be extra capacity?
- The approach roads from the A12 should be improved before any further development is considered.
- The pavements to the High School are narrow and children walking will have to cross a busy main road.
- Good farming land will be taken, depriving this country of much needed crop growing land.
- The application fails to meet policy CS11, failing the most basic tests on landscape, proportionality, sustainability, social cohesion and heritage.
- There is no evidence to support the need for 50 affordable homes in the village. The figure is merely the percentage figure your Council requires, applied to the number of houses the developer wants to build.
- Housing need has been established by an independent source collecting evidence for the NP and is half the figure in the application over the next 15 years.
- It is hard to believe that much consultation has been carried out with Tendring District Council as the developments in Brantham, Manningtree, Mistely and Lawford will swamp a tight area with approximately 1500 to 2000 houses.
- The high pitched roofs will enable 3 bedroomed houses to be expanded into 5 bedrooms, of which the village is not short.
- A cursory look at the village will show that this is not some kind of village vernacular.

- Babergh is a delightful part of rural Suffolk, never heard of by the British public. Constable Country on the other hand has been close to the minds and hearts of the British people for two hundred years.
- Babergh is lucky to have two of the most famous artists England has ever produced. Let's not spoil it for future generations.
- Having experienced a 15% increase to a village in Cambridgeshire, it completely changed its aesthetic from a small and intimate country village to that of a small town.
- The developers have not approached the village occupants to ascertain local housing requirements.
- Are not aware of any substantial employment or business benefit to the village from the proposal.
- Already unable to get appointments at the doctors now.
- The traffic counters were located in the wrong location.
- John Constable would be turning in his grave to see what you are doing.
- Large developments at Foxhall Fields, Richardsons Road and Elm Estate have significantly increased the size of the village. In addition, developments at Notcutts, Quintons Corner, Flatford Lane, Heath Road, Elm Road, Aldous Close, Coillingwood Fields, Hop Meadow, Beehive Close, Carriers Close, Heath Close and many other infill sites have all added to the size of the village. The growth has taken place without significant increase in the services available within the village.
- The road infrastructure has not been improved for many years.
- The connections to the East are nothing more than country lanes and at times dangerous.
- The water supply/waste drainage system has not been enlarged for a considerable amount of time and would need expansion to cope.
- Where will the funding for these improvements come from?
- As parents with young children we are extremely concerned that our child's welfare will be negatively influenced by the development due to potential overcrowding over local schools, local facilities, traffic, noise, and pollution.
- The houses would increase the impact on Manningtree Station and increase the problems of parking there.
- This would exacerbate the situation on Touchey's Hill and make that situation even more dangerous, with cars overtaking cyclists on blind bends.
- There are sites in Ipswich, Colchester, on brownfield sites, that would be much more suitable. Why an area of natural beauty is on the list is beyond my comprehension and ought to be reconsidered.
- The village has the beauty of St Mary's Church and its floor-bound bell cage.
- It is impossible to add such a high number of buildings and not expect the tourist attractions to fall in visitation numbers.
- There seems to be little or no correlation to the existing village context, just simply dumped on some available land without thought for the environment, dwellers or wildlife.
- Proposes a development of 20-30 homes on this site.
- Develop – yes, over-develop – no.
- Given the historic nature of the village have the conservation officers in Babergh got any view on the harm caused by the proposed development and do the developers have any reasonable justification cited for the harm?
- The proposed design and colour of the houses is also completely out of line with those in the village.
- The bridge/tunnel near Manningtree Station is already a nightmare.

- Before any development is approved in the village there needs to be improvements to the railway crossing in Manningtree first.
- Why not use the fields off Slough Lane instead? The houses could be accommodated there with the options of Manningtree and Brantham Co-op to service newcomers.
- As a visitor I think I would be unlikely to want to continue to visit, it is the age, charm, pace of life that is so attractive.
- Who are these homes for? Will they be for local residents or expensive buy to lets? As a Council you can't afford to get this decision wrong.
- We will need more shops, doctors and schools.
- This plan would have an adverse effect on the village's aim to preserve historic features and to promote high standards of planning.
- The 2008 Housing Needs Survey is quoted but this was followed by the survey carried out by Community Action Suffolk which identified that East Bergholt had a need for 25-30 dwellings.
- Both District and County Councils should wish to maintain this unique village in its current size and form to continue to attract the lucrative tourist trade.
- Once developed we will never get it back.
- I am not convinced that there is the need to build the vast amount of homes in England, let alone East Bergholt, that is reported in the media.
- The designs are out of balance with the Grade II or Grade I listed buildings in the village.
- Existing undeveloped sites such as the Vacant EDME buildings in Mistle should be developed first. These would provide the 'affordable' housing whilst maintaining buildings of heritage and interest.
- Will the sewage output be met by existing services off Flatford Lane or will these processing plants need to be expanded, yet more concrete and loss of trees?
- We have an ageing population and many people will be wanting to downsize along with youngsters wishing to get their first property and I think more consideration needs to be given to a proportionate amount of housing to meet these needs.
- There should be more housing for retired couples who do not need such large homes. They could then move into smaller properties and release larger homes for others.
- The pavement widths mean that wheelchair users, people pushing buggies and other users are already at risk.
- There is very little employment in the village and the chance of attracting more is nil. Paying lip service to your 'employment led housing policy' by putting further units in the application is an insult and will not address the needs of people living in the development.
- The bus service is insufficient to get to Ipswich or Colchester during normal working hours.
- The proposed travel plan will never work, and would need to be in place when the first residents moved in and stay in place for some time after all houses are occupied. This means this plan will have to be maintained for at least 6 years, who funds this effort?
- How would the travel plan process continue when residents change?
- The two industrial parks in East Bergholt experience a high turnover and difficulty in letting vacant units.
- The developer has not submitted any visualisations of the development from the A12.

- The Energy Statement is incomplete as it ignores the effects carbon sequestration due to loss of agricultural land and carbon generated by commuting.
- The Statement of Community Involvement is very misleading. A separate exit poll showed that 98% did not support this application. A greater number of people responded to this poll than Bidwells questionnaire, giving a more representative data set.
- Roads within the development do not have footpaths.
- None of the three roads that could be used to reach the shop have continuous footpaths. This does not meet the Core Strategy requirement.
- Statements have been issued by Babergh that there are 50 people on the social needs register who have expressed a desire to live in East Bergholt, the evidence suggests that this is a gross exaggeration. In practice, there were no people who applied to live in the recently built affordable homes in Fiddlers Lane. It took many months to find residents.
- The views of residents in the NP survey was that on road parking should be avoided.
- The development is designed around two recreational areas and is “inward looking”. This will discourage people living in the proposed estate to travel the distances necessary to join in the community activities, encouraging the development of a separate ‘ghetto’ outside the village.
- Shows a carbon audit for a household in East Bergholt with two people working, where commuting contributes nearly 1/3 of the carbon emissions.
- Suffolk is supposed to be working towards being the ‘Greenest County’. How can it be environmentally responsible to build on green fields, miles from where the employment is located.
- The houses will not even fit with landscape as they will be modern and will look completely out of place.
- There is no indication as to when the development will stop. You may as well build on every bit of grass there is if you want more housing.
- Existing class sizes at the school are already too large, as some are reaching over 30.
- More students means more distractions and this will not enable the students to do their work.
- A large proportion of the secondary school children are children who do not live in the catchment area and live in towns, this will only get worse.
- It will cause overpopulation.
- It will turn the village into a permanent traffic jam like Colchester.
- As Fellows of the RSPB we are not convinced that the impact of the development would adversely affect the diverse birdlife and other wildlife which is so rich in the village.
- I would fully endorse the objections made by the East Bergholt Society and Action East Bergholt.
- The development will only attract people from outside the village who will then commute.
- There are no serious traffic calming measures in the village and the 30mph limit is ineffectual and abused.
- Parking in the village centre and on Hadleigh Road and Elm Road is chaotic now and the village car park is little used, so what will it be like with 300 extra cars accessing it.
- Any District Council that sanctioned such a monstrous idea would only prove how ‘out of touch’ it is with the electorate.
- Both hedgehogs and stag beetles are present here.

- The number of placards demonstrate that there is a very strong body of objection.
- People are in a village for a reason, we pay for that privilege through house prices and our council tax.
- The application is described as a full application but there is reference in the documentation to the application being an outline.
- The Planning Statement contains a number of inaccuracies, obfuscating formulations and aspirational words rather than actual commitments. It also relies heavily on desktop analysis rather than proper investigations.
- The application will create immediate and long term costs implications for the community which will have to be met by the villagers.
- The pelican crossings will cause traffic disruption.
- There are no facilities in the development that would encourage existing villagers to enter, therefore the development would not integrate.
- The village is dark due to the lack of street lighting, which makes walking after dark dangerous.
- Irrespective of the walking distances involved, crossing the B1070 on foot is already very difficult.
- Consideration must be had to the financial and environmental cost of putting dwellings where people will need to travel for work.
- The buildings design takes it lead from buildings in the Netherlands. How can this be in keeping with the character of the village?
- Visitors and residents of the development would give rise to disturbance to existing properties in the locality.
- If the business units are to remain, then the hours of operation should be limited.
- Details a list of conditions that should be imposed if permission is granted, including hours of working, limitation on noise and dust levels, lighting should be limited and not affect adjoining properties, rubbish removal from the site, no burning of rubbish from the site, no access from Moore's Lane during or after the construction phase and limitation of storage heights.
- Our village shop recently withdrew a planning application for an extension so must be assumed to have capacity problems serving the community.
- The village facilities have been overstated in the proposals and there are glaring inaccuracies when studied with any local knowledge.
- Conflicting comments from Environment and Highways make the delivery of the proposals in a safe way impossible.
- Given the poor quality of the A12 junctions, traffic will use Hughes Lane as many already do, which is a poor quality road.
- The submitted plans are significantly different to those which were shown to the community.
- In fifteen years time, this 'Legoland' approach will be considered an architectural assault on the sense in a rural setting.
- Insufficient parking arrangements will lead to cars parked out the front of house on windy roads creating an eye sore and frustrating place to live.
- Any councillor that likes the ideas of these estates should move to Colchester and try living in one for 6 months.
- The price that these houses will attract, due to being in East Bergholt, will not make them affordable and Brantham, Manningtree and Lawford service the need for more affordable housing.
- The public has a right to expect that any development has low environmental impact and positively enhances the landscape and nature conservation value of the locality.

- Babergh has a duty to have regard to biodiversity conservation under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and to the two AONBs nearby.
- The planting to be carried out should be of native species.
- All planting/seeding should be of UK and, wherever possible, local provenance.
- Monoculture hedging should be avoided.
- A long term maintenance agreement should be secured by planning condition.
- Surface water runoff should be either be subject to local attenuation or fed into the proposed attenuation area before being allowed to flow into the watercourse.
- The Core Strategy is jobs-led, but there is limited opportunity in East Bergholt.
- The development is contrary to policy CS02 which seeks to safeguard the landscape, being adjacent to the AONB.
- The development is similar to one on Colchester Rugby Club site, and is more suited to the outskirts of a town.
- The application has no independent traffic analysis.
- The Council has a duty of care to protect green belt from development.
- The applicants failed to liaise with the community.
- The developers are set on forestalling our Neighbourhood Plan.
- There could be far more than 300 homes at Brantham, and the Inspector at the Core Strategy had his arm up his back and had to agree to a green field site next to it at the time the Strategy was prepared.
- The proposed increase of 1200 homes at Lawford/Manningtree./Mistely will have massive traffic effects.
- Can you justify Babergh District Council £144,000 kick back from this development v the immeasurable damage it will do to this area and tourism. If Babergh DC needs £144,000 then we will try and raise this in the village.
- I understand that the Planning Committee is heavily weighted by officers from other areas, doubtless quite happy to see building in East Bergholt rather than on their own doorsteps.
- The developer has clearly been emboldened by Babergh's reported support of the proposal and encouragement to proceed to the planning application stage. This pre-emptive action to frustrate implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan is not welcomed.
- Why is there no LVIA with the submission? Could it be that this would reinforce the point that the development is inappropriate?
- A modern housing estate so close to the historic core will have a profound impact on the landscape, environmental and heritage characteristics of the village.
- Babergh has a pretty mixed record over the last 50 years, with some poor developments allowed. It would be a tragedy to repeat this mistake.
- I object that there doesn't appear to be a large enough percentage of affordable housing for the younger members of East Bergholt, having had children who have had to move away to get on the property ladder. This does not appear to have been taken into consideration.
- The village was some time ago voted the 9th best village in the UK.
- The development should be sited in Raydon/Holton St Mary so that they can establish their own facilities and business premises.
- The affordable housing for most people living in East Bergholt should be smaller, sensitively built properties for professional people getting on the property ladder.
- Horse riding through the village has become very dangerous. This would make it worse.

- The positioning of fences, sheds, conservatories, greenhouses and other garden structures along the Moore's Lane boundary will result in urbanisation and detriment to the rural area and wildlife.
- Even if planting was achieved along this boundary, it would take many years to mature.
- Seek assurances that construction traffic will not use Moore's Lane.
- Whilst Knight Developments may stand scrutiny based on their past achievements, it seems common knowledge that they are currently winding down, liquidating or selling the company. This may be hearsay, but there is a risk that the site may be undeveloped and contribute nothing to the housing needs of the area or Babergh's finances.
- The development may pass to national builders with far less interest in our local environment, they may make an application to up the density or downgrade what is proposed to make profits.
- Question whether sufficient research has been carried out to determine the natural drainage capability of the existing ditches and piped culvert systems.
- Land adjacent to the medical centre is much better for development.
- There is no justification to say there is an undersupply of open space in the village.
- Are astonished that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.
- Is there more development to come after this?
- There is nothing in the Core Strategy that says all this development should happen at once.
- The field at the end of Elm Road would be ideal for development of smaller homes that people in the village could one day afford.
- The internet in the village has gone from bad to abysmal in the last 2 to 3 years. As a business in the village that is dependent on this, we would be directly affected by 144 more internet connections. This would take our communications back ten years.
- There are no plans to upgrade the telephone exchange.
- The development does not comply with SC11 and common sense should dictate that this application is not only ridiculous but illegal.
- The height of some of the buildings is nearly 11m. The sharp 'steep' pitches are out of keeping with a country location.
- I support the application. The questionnaire that appeared in the village was written in a biased fashion so that it appeared there was no support.
- I own a business in the village and admit it will be beneficial for the application to be approved. However, my daughter has had to move out of the village as there is nothing in the lower price range in the village, so affordable housing would be a great asset.
- As long as the development is done tastefully I do not feel the village would suffer as a whole to any great extent. I am aware of many others who feel the same way but there does not seem to be a platform for us to support it on. I therefore say yes to 144.
- Growth should depend on the size and character and the location of the development in relation to the relevant Core/Hinterland village.
- One could drive in South Essex and see exactly the same design in a low cost residential area.
- The application incorrectly lists that land as not the best and most versatile, when the NPPF identifies that it is as it is Grade 2 land.
- As planners you will be aware of how many villages were destroyed in the 1960s by mass development, therefore why is this being considered in 2015.

- Raises concerns over the Council's website and not being able to access some of the documents.
- The government is encouraging the building of more houses but this means where they are needed, where they best fit and of the type required.
- Having recently moved to the village, there are no school places available and have to travel to another village to find a primary place.
- The amount of development should be spread in smaller numbers across a number of villages.
- Fiddlers Lane will be used as a rat run to get from the heart of the village back to Moore's Lane.
- The chemist is unable to cope.
- The amount of land proposed to be used has greatly increased from the original plans.
- The village envelope should not be breached.
- I fully support this proposal as it is the only way starter homes and small family homes will be built which this village urgently needs.
- The current policy of only allowing small developments results in 4 bedroom executive housing.
- There will be a long term problem in the area involving water shortages.
- The Transport Plan indicates 90+ vehicle movements for each peak period. The Census Data 2011 indicates an average car ownership of 1.49 cars per household in Babergh. This would equate to an 214 vehicles, I question the validity of the data used.
- We are a happy band of people who like our village as it is. Please leave us alone to enjoy it.
- By removing a large area of arable land, it will remove an employment site.
- By increasing the population without the provision of sufficient jobs, the overall number of opportunities per resident will be reduced.
- The proposal does not include innovative measures to reduce the carbon footprint.
- Without additional pumping stations, I expect the water pressure to be further impacted.
- The houses are simply too big, too close together and turn their backs on the village.
- Appreciate that refusing the application would deny Babergh DC a windfall New Homes Bonus payment. However, section 70(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act says it would not be appropriate to make a decision based on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority or other Government body.
- Granting permission for this scheme would set a precedent that would see the whole of the open ground between the present settlement boundary and the A12 smothered in housing.
- The new development would shift the centre of gravity of the village. Many of the facilities centred around the church are not within the 800m walking limit. The new dwellings would dilute the central focus of the village community.
- Raises concerns that the radius of consultation with residents was not the same size as the site, and that only 3 residents were consulted. Why was I not consulted as I live close by and my neighbours got letters?
- A few years ago those fields had a very large pipe buried along their boundary. What was that pipe for? It may well be utility ducting bringing services that run along the side of the A12. That would show pre-knowledge of the aforementioned plans along with pre-acceptance of the plans.

- If permission is given then a s106 agreement should secure a larger village hall or community hall, better sports facilities and playgrounds, a library and safe cycle route to Manningtree.
- The Council should refuse the application and work with the Parish Council and community to introduce the new Neighbourhood Plan and agree the East Bergholt housing targets over the next 5, 10 and 15 years.
- Why has my online comment been recorded as 'Neutral' when I ticked the 'Object' box?
- This is without doubt a matter of convenience for the local district council, in attempting to use existing facilities without increasing local infrastructure.
- A planning development of this size should involve strategic planning.
- The developer appears to have taken some of my initial comments on board. The proposals now include short terraces of smaller units.
- I am impressed that over 80 percent of the gross units proposed are three bedroom or smaller, and that the elevations are avoiding the clichés of mock barns and faux Tudor houses, reflecting the village vernacular but with a modern take.
- The proposal no longer includes a public building which I had hoped would help the new estate gel into a semi self-contained hamlet.
- I genuinely believe that the decision to identify East Bergholt as 'core' was erroneous and the Council's consideration of this application should reconsider that decision.
- Ipswich has hundreds of unfinished dwellings partially built and Babergh would do well to devise a plan to finish these off as they have been shelved since 2010.
- Recommends refusal on the basis of policy CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 (2006) and paragraph 56 of the NPPF, both of which require good design.
- The house styles and mix proposed are almost certain not to reflect the actual needs going forward over the next fifteen years. The proposal runs the risk that houses built now will not be appropriate nor integrated with the rest of the village.
- We consider that the development should not be considered in isolation but from the Committee's wider responsibilities and judged from that point of view.
- It is not democratic to go against the will of the village.
- The core of East Bergholt is actually closer to 800 households, with 184 being located at East where they are closer to Brantham. This affects the percentage to which the village will be increased.
- The boundary hedge is anywhere between 5 and 6 hundred years old and contains a mixture of native species. One cannot emphasise enough the loss of nesting sites for our hedgerow birds.
- The village has developed organically over the years, and this should continue to be so.
- East Bergholt values and celebrates its green spaces.
- The comments made are not NIMBY ones, as the P survey showed that most people accept the need for future housing in the village.
- East Bergholt has been designated a low light pollution area, there should be no more streetlights.
- The village lacks facilities for younger people, especially teenagers and lack of public transport in the evenings to get to larger centres for entertainment.
- The comments from Environmental Protection has highlighted the loss of amenity to surrounding properties during the construction phase. As this will last until 2031, this cannot be controlled by a condition.

- The logic that no CIL is required is flawed, as it is assumed that available spaces across the various year groups will match demand, whereas in fact a number of year groups have very few spaces available. This would require significant capital spend to address.
- The fact that previous Councils and Governments have mismanaged the housing stock should not be taken out on the current inhabitants of the village. There are plenty of existing properties to cater for the needs of the poor and unfortunate villagers who cannot afford their own property.
- The new proposal would give rise to trouble, and questions how long there would not be graffiti on the bus shelter.
- What is the need for five bedroom properties in the development?
- That NHS England think there is sufficient capacity at the medical practice is a surprise, as you have to queue up outside to get an appointment.
- Apparently the B1070 is to be straightened; this will only make traffic go faster.
- What this village needs is a development for older people, with bungalows, single or double apartments and a care home.
- This can only be seen as creating another East End, but in one big collection of houses.
- Many of the visitors to this area are from abroad and they specifically come to Bergholt because of its beauty, rural setting and heritage.
- East Bergholt is a village not a town.
- Refers to the Local Plan which aims to steer development to those areas which have the services and employment opportunities to support it, and focusses development on market towns that have access to good quality public transport.
- The proposed density is far too high, whatever the calculations used the density on the ground will match some sort of standard for medium density that has an urban area in mind. Hop Meadow would provide a reasonable benchmark, though not all dwellings should be as big as those in Hop Meadow.
- A development of half the number of houses, released in equal instalments over a period of 5 to seven years would seem a sensible and significant contribution.
- Trusts that officers will rise above the pressures of having to fill quotas and reaching targets, and thereby emphasise quality and suitability of any development rather than just quantity.
- Submits evidence from the Core Strategy and the Inspectors report to support the position that the development does not comply with policies.
- The condensed building period of three years would maximise disruption from builders and their vehicles.
- There is significant congestion around the schools at the beginning and start of the day.
- One can't help wondering if there has been a conspiracy to actively divert 100s of cars and lorries through East Bergholt over the last 14 weeks (allegedly due to A12 road works) in order to acclimatise us all to the Moore's Lane estate.
- The bakery has been given an eviction notice so that the landlord can capitalise on the profit from the Moore's Lane development.
- Construction vehicles will deposit mud on the roads. Will the Council compensate anyone who is injured as a result?
- How will East Bergholt cope with extra lorries on the road?
- The application pre-empts the Local Site Allocation Plan and any decision on development should be deferred until the plan is published.
- The car park behind the Red Lion pub would not be adequate for the extra vehicles, exacerbating the on street parking problems.

- Suffolk Wildlife Trust need to present their survey to protect the wildlife we have.
- The village survey identified that people wanted all new houses to have a decent front garden, keeping the living space away from the road. The new development has a lot of properties with no front gardens and no parking, making for a claustrophobic and crowded area.
- Requests extensions of time to make comments due to the documents not being visible on the website for some time after the letter was received about the application.
- I will find it very difficult to enjoy my garden during the summer months due to extra traffic, noise and pollution.
- Driving into the village will get increasingly difficult.
- My son is keen to get a job in agriculture but building on Grade 2 land will not improve his chances.
- The gardens are so small that even our business, which is a nursery, will not benefit. Our takings are going down not up and our staff turnover is decreasing, despite weekly requests for jobs.
- I would stress that other developments within Babergh have been proposed at Hadleigh, Pinewood, Shotley, Holbrook and Brantham, all of which will add extra drain on the Police, Ambulance and Fire Service as well as the Council services which have had to make significant cuts. They are unable to cope fully now, this will make the cover dangerously low.
- Simple suggestions made to the developer at the public meeting to improve the development have not been taken up.
- Raises concerns over the impact on bees, which forage on the land and would be subjected to further environmental stresses.
- There are other developments happening in the village which are gradual and do not provide severe shock such as would result from this development.
- The land is needed for food security as part of a national requirement, an important point.
- In 2014, the CPRE estimated that more than 1,000,000 new homes could be accommodated on land that has been previously developed, and that more brownfield sites are becoming available. The Government is also releasing land from its surplus. These two avenues should be explored first.
- The decision should be passed up the chain so that this heavy responsibility may fall on shoulders of men and women to who betrayal of the public and questionable morality are part of their everyday calling. Not the District Council, who I believe are still served by people of integrity who take their democratic duties as a sacred trust.
- A much larger proportion of the two bedroom homes should be open market properties available for young, working, local people to buy.
- I understand Knights may be selling the site.
- The A12 slip roads require improvement whether or not the development takes place.
- Fully endorse the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan to provide smaller developments of up to 10-15 dwellings spread across a number of sites. This is the result of the village survey and should be agreeable.
- The village is not adverse to growth, but this needs to be sustainable and given proper consideration.
- I suspect there is a high water table there which is good for crops but not for buildings.
- Should wait for a national standardised approach to calculating supply of housing

- What evidence has provided and what basis of need has been provided?
- No request has gone out to request to supply of land
- The justification given in the interim statement is that the review was a consequence of the successful Judicial Review of East Bergholt against a decision of Planning Committee. This is just plain wrong. The Judicial Review ruled that 'local need' had to be interpreted more narrowly than had been done. This is nothing to do with the delivery in urban or rural areas.
- BDC has accepted desk top studies from developers, increased requirements and reduced supply and rewritten history.
- Lichfield Report is based on desk top study. Does not analyse where the growth in the past has taken place. Or where real developments targets or growth areas are.
- Policies CS2, CS11 and the EBNP should still apply in the decision making process.
- This was confirmed by the Supreme Court in Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins and Richborough Estates V Cheshire East BC.
- Committee needs to assess the development against sections 58, 70 and 71 and well as chapters 11 and 12.
- Material weight must be given to the ministerial statement dated 12 December 2016 which requires due consideration given to Neighbourhood Plans less than 2 years old.
- No analysis on what sustainable means. The development is the opposite of sustainable.
- Housing must be jobs led. Jobs will not move to East Bergholt if new houses are built. Inhabitants will commute.
- Who are Countryside Properties? What is their status in the process?
- The identity of the applicant is a fundamental requirement and consultees and interested parties should have a 21 day consultation period to consider the same. The current process is flawed and could be challenged.
- No interest in preserving the beauty of East Bergholt.
- Development goes against the Neighbourhood Plan.
- If people want to own a home they must work for it. It is not a God-given right. People can not always live where they want.
- Traffic is at a point where riding a bike can be dangerous. Too much traffic on the road.
- This site is too big and in the wrong place. Medical services in the village and hospitals are in melt-down. Roads and highways are unsafe. Bus service will not service its needs. Duty to protect the AONB is under scrutiny.
- Convinced that Council has purposely manipulated the land supply numbers in the Interim Report to distort the situation from 5.7 years to 3 years and have connived with developers to bring forward this and other applications.
- Did you lie to the Government in previous AMR's?
- Another 144 houses in this area is impossible
- Lack of footpaths
- Roads already congested.
- A12 will experience severe congestion
- BDC has failed to monitor the fundamental pillars of the Core Strategy. Housing should be jobs led. No need for such a development.
- Wish the village to grow in smaller clusters
- Village Plan was very clear in how residents want the village to develop.
- We need fields to feed our growing population.
- Need to build on brownfield sites. We need to build for the poor and the young.

- At least 144 people will be commuting out of the village.
- Parking around the shops is already horrendous.
- Not standing in the way of new homes. Not nimbies. Just want the right form of development.
- Schools are currently oversubscribed.
- Will lead to more accidents at the main junctions.
- The development does not comply with Policies EB1, EB2, EB6, EB9, EB14 and EB16 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Should wait for a national standardised approach to calculating supply of housing
- What evidence has provided and what basis of need has been provided?
- No request has gone out to request to supply of land
- The justification given in the interim statement is that the review was a consequence of the successful Judicial Review of East Bergholt against a decision of Planning Committee. This is just plain wrong. The Judicial Review ruled that 'local need' had to be interpreted more narrowly than had been done. This is nothing to do with the delivery in urban or rural areas.
- BDC has accepted desk top studies from developers, increased requirements and reduced supply and rewritten history.
- Lichfield Report is based on desk top study. Does not analyse where the growth in the past has taken place. Or where real developments targets or growth areas are.
- Policies CS2, CS11 and the EBNP should still apply in the decision making process.
- This was confirmed by the Supreme Court in Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins and Richnorough Estates V Cheshire East BC.
- Committee needs to assess the development against sections 58, 70 and 71 and well as chapters 11 and 12.
- Material weight must be given to the ministerial statement dated 12 December 2016 which requires due consideration given to Neighbourhood Plans less than 2 years old.
- No analysis on what sustainable means. The development is the opposite of sustainable.
- Housing must be jobs led. Jobs will not move to East Bergholt if new houses are built. Inhabitants will commute.
- Who are Countryside Properties? What is their status in the process?
- The identity of the applicant is a fundamental requirement and consultees and interested parties should have a 21 day consultation period to consider the same. The current process is flawed and could be challenged.
- No interest in preserving the beauty of East Bergholt.
- Development goes against the Neighbourhood Plan.
- If people want to own a home they must work for it. It is not a God-given right. People can not always live where they want.
- Traffic is at a point where riding a bike can be dangerous. Too much traffic on the road.
- This site is too big and in the wrong place. Medical services in the village and hospitals are in melt-down. Roads and highways are unsafe. Bus service will not service its needs. Duty to protect the AONB is under scrutiny.
- Convinced that Council has purposely manipulated the land supply numbers in the Interim Report to distort the situation from 5.7 years to 3 years and have connived with developers to bring forward this and other applications.
- Did you lie to Government in previous AMR's?
- Another 144 houses in this area is impossible

- Lack of footpaths
- Roads already congested.
- A12 will experience severe congestion
- BDC has failed to monitor the fundamental pillars of the Core Strategy. Housing should be jobs led. No need for such a development.
- Wish the village to grow in smaller clusters
- Village Plan was very clear in how residents want the village to develop.
- We need fields to feed our growing population.
- Need to build on brownfield sites. We need to build for the poor and the young.
- At least 144 people will be commuting out of the village.
- Parking around the shops is already horrendous.
- Not standing in the way of new homes. Not nimbies. Just want the right form of development.
- Schools are currently oversubscribed.
- Will lead to more accidents at the main junctions.
- The development does not comply with Policies EB1, EB2, EB6, EB9, EB14 and EB16 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- I am disabled and park my car on Gaston Street when I go to the shops. If there are more cars and I can't park then I won't be able to do this.
- The local community must be protected against the power developers who do not have the same historical, emotional or economic commitment to the village nor have to live here but are driven by the goal of maximising their investment.
- All these proposed developments are against the Neighbourhood Plan which was voted for and accepted by Babergh but for some reason Babergh /Mid Suffolk seem determined to build some units in East Bergholt even though these are not wanted now and never will be.

Action East Bergholt

Initial response received 31 July 2015 –

The submission made takes the form of a 43 page “Statement of Objections” which includes the following summary;

- **Action East Bergholt** objects strongly to the planning application for 144 dwellings for the following reasons:-
 - (i) the proposed development is disproportionate in terms of its size and out of scale with its location. The proposed development would result in an increase in dwellings in East Bergholt core village of approximately 15% without taking into account developments that might come forward on other sites within and adjoining the built-up area. This scale of increase is considered to be disproportionate with adverse consequences for the landscape, the setting of the village and the capacity of local services and infrastructure to absorb such a short-term level of growth.
 - (ii) the recently conducted village survey carried out on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan resulted in a 47% household response. It revealed that the majority of respondents (87%) supported moderate growth of the village over the next 20yrs, in the range of 5% - 10%, with individual developments of no more than 6 – 15 homes. The information was available to the Applicant and has clearly been ignored;

(iii) the cumulative impact of development given the scale of this proposal, other options on the edge of East Bergholt and within the Functional Cluster centred on East Bergholt.

(iv) the landscape on this edge to the village is very open and with long distance views from as far off as the A12. As such a development of this size cannot be accommodated without causing serious and unacceptable harm to the landscape and the countryside setting to the village – see report by The Landscape Partnership (this was appended as their Appendix 1).

(v) the change to this main gateway to East Bergholt, leading to the heart of Constable Country, will have a negative impact on how tourist experience their visit to the village and its associated attractions.

(vi) serious issues with the design of the development see review by John Lyall (this was appended to the statement as their Appendix 2). The review by the RIBA Suffolk Design Review Panel (this was appended to the statement as their Appendix 3) highlighted significant deficiencies when it reviewed a previous design and recommended that a revised proposal should be brought back to the panel, which did not occur.

(vii) the distance between the site and the key facilities in the village combined with inadequate pedestrian links means that most residents are likely to use their cars so compounding the problems of congestion.

(viii) highway/pedestrian safety issues arising from the poor standard of the slip roads on to the A12, the addition of 8 accesses on to the B1070, the unsafe pedestrian crossings and the lack of safe pedestrian links to local amenities and services.

(ix) the absence of a convenient bus service for anyone having to use public transport to commute between either Ipswich or Colchester.

(x) The lack of employment opportunities in the village means that the majority of working people are likely to commute to locations outside the village.

(xi) concerns about the potential impact on heritage assets in the form of any significant archaeological finds given the lack of proper investigation.

(xii) the total absence of a proven local need for the number of proposed dwellings as clearly demonstrated by the results of the surveys carried out to inform the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

(xiii) the unjustified use of best and most versatile (Grade 2) agricultural land;.

(xiv) based upon local knowledge AEB see very little requirement for 'Business Units' as there are several unoccupied both within the village and its hinterland and this is stated in the application that they will only be built if pre-let;

(xv) AEB see no proven need to provide 144 dwellings on this site especially when:-

a) there are 300 vacant homes within Babergh – 200 up to 2 years old and an additional 100 between 2-5yrs (response to Freedom of Information Request dated 16th July 2015); and

b) they understand that as of April 2015 there are 800 homes within the District that have obtained planning permission, but have yet to be started.

Second response received 8 September 2015 –

- These changes appear to result in the total eradication of the existing hedge bordering the B1070 and a mature Oak tree which the applicant has previously thought fit to retain.
- As such, the adverse and unacceptable impact of the development on the local environment that was detailed in my original submission is exacerbated by these changes to an extent that is not counter balanced by the changes.
- The traffic calming measures will only serve to compound the suburbanising effect of the development at this important entry to the village.

Further response received 15 November 2015 -

- The revised plans address the sight line issues raised by SCC Highways and some of the main footpath issues and widths in the immediate locality of the site local area, but stop short at the Quinton Road junction. Consequently, they completely fail to address the difficulties with the footpaths beyond this junction, crucially leading to both the School and Doctors' Surgery, and where wheel chairs / pushchairs and children are forced into the main road.
- The absence of an uninterrupted pedestrian link from Fiddlers Lane to Hadleigh Road, thereby giving a continuous walkway to the A12 without the necessity to make two unsafe crossings of the B1070 is unacceptable.
- Whatever else improvements might be proposed they do not deal with the dangers created for pedestrians using Gaston Street where there is no provision for any footpath between Gaston End (Carriers Arms PH) corner and Chaplins Road, a key link to the village centre (see comments below on the Road Safety Audit).
- On the north side of B1070 there would be 3 new road junctions in addition to the junctions with Moores Lane and Beehive Close, plus the 5 new private driveways. This factor, combined with the 2 re-sited bus stop shelters, the 3 new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings, the entrances to Foxhall Fields and Fiddlers Lane and the driveways to properties on the south side of the road will make this a very hazardous stretch of road for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.
- The removal of the roadside hedges and significant oak tree will improve visibility, but opening up the road frontage is likely to increase motorists' disregard for the speed limit on a stretch of road that will only become busier and more hazardous as a result of the changes outlined above and new developments at Mistley, Lawford, Manningtree and Brantham.
- The stated amendments clearly add to the resulting problems in so far as the 'shrinking' road width caused by the increased width of pathways, the road width requirements are for a min of 7m and not as now stated. The resultant road width will have a serious impact on agricultural vehicles which require to use this road on a regular basis & require to negotiate the Gaston End/Gaston Street junction.
It is unfortunate that the road safety audit site visit was done between 1030/1130 hrs and not 0830/0930 when traffic and pedestrians are at maximum.
- The audit refers to the new pathways and safe walking to Local Schools and Facilities - but fails to address the obvious B1070 pathway problems from Gaston End to the High School and Doctors' Surgery.

- Whilst the audit discusses the Gaston Road Junction it fails to take into account the absence of footpaths in Gaston Street which is the main bus route and pedestrian route leading to the centre of the village, where the main facilities are located, i.e. shops / post office, chemist / churches etc.
- It also fails to address the 5 new car accesses to proposed houses or the 3 new uncontrolled pedestrian road crossings.
- Their additional absence of comment on the Four Sisters Junction especially South Bound entry onto the A12 and a failure to comment on the cyclists serious safety issues up/down Touchy Hill demonstrates avoidance of key safety issues raised relating to this development application
- In addition Fenn Wright's comments clearly state that the business units planned parking provision as "Only just adequate"..... this demonstrates a firm indication of the potential 'over-spillage' of related cars and vans etc onto the poorly designed 144 estate roadways, but more important onto main B1070 road at the most hazardous point.

East Bergholt Society

Initial response received 10 July 2015 -

- I am writing this letter of objection on behalf of the East Bergholt Society, the local amenity society formed in 1972 the aims of which include securing the preservation and protection of features of historic and/or public interest and the promotion of high standards of planning and architecture: upon which the above application would have great impact.
- The application fails to comply with numerous policies set out in NPPF and Babergh's Core Strategy, particularly CS11, CS11 Supplementary Planning Document July 2014, and CS15.
 1. It does **not** meet locally identified need.
 2. It does **not** respect the local context and character of the village.
 3. It does **not** respect the historic assets.
 4. It does **not** make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area.
- **Point 1.1** The applicant cites Babergh District's 2008 Housing Needs Survey. This is superceded by the Housing Needs Survey conducted in June 2015 by Community Action Suffolk at the suggestion of Babergh District Council and as part of the evidence base for the East Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan. The result of that survey indicates a need for 25 – 30 dwellings in East Bergholt.
- This is further supported by the Neighbourhood Plan's Questionnaire. Housing for the elderly is clearly identified as in demand and many respondents made the point that filling this demand would free up family homes. This proposed development is not a proportionate addition to the 1,200 existing dwellings (some 900 in the main village and the remainder at East End), nor does it address these needs in terms of numbers or types of dwellings: 50 affordable and 94 market value dwellings.
- **Point 1.2** The applicant states that the East Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan is "not at an advanced stage". The East Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan **IS** at an advanced stage.
- Both the Questionnaire analysis and the Housing Needs Survey summary are available on the village website for public inspection.

- **Points 2, 3 and 4** - The applicant states that the application “*attaches great importance to design*” but gives no evidence to support the statement. Saying it does not make it so. In what way has this scheme been designed to respect the local context and character of the village? How does it respect the historic assets? How does it make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area?
- It is in reality an “identikit” estate development such as could be bolted onto any conurbation. It could be on the edge of Colchester, Ipswich or Chelmsford. The houses are too tall and too cramped. They largely look inwards towards the central “roundabout”. The roads and driveways would be littered with parked cars. The proposal would be more appropriate in a suburban location, not on the edge of a village where development should retain a greater spatial quality as a soft edge to the village.
- The nature of the existing village is that it has grown piecemeal but certain features are constant. Roofs are generally of lower pitch and houses sit comfortably in gardens and within the street scene. The substantial post war and 1970s estates are built on discreet sites so that it is possible to pass through the village without seeing them at all: a happy situation for residents and visitors alike. This development would be all too obvious.
- The sheer size of the development, so many houses built all at once and on the one site, make it wholly inappropriate. It would irrevocably destroy the view on the major approach to the village which at present is still a “long view” across open fields. The rise of the land means the too tall buildings would be even more obvious and out of place obliterating the existing softer edge to the village. The density of the site in comparison to the neighbouring properties is shown very clearly in the applicant’s own site plan and it should also be pointed out that many of the properties on the south side of the B1070 are of single storey.
- The non residential buildings would be a particularly inappropriate addition to the street scene. There is nothing that can be said in favour of them, their design nor their proposed siting in an otherwise completely residential area. Contrary to NPPF, there is no indication that a sequential approach to choosing this site has been followed nor any evidence to support the applicant’s claim that no other sites are available, particularly sites that are NOT on grade 2 agricultural land.
- The applicant’s assertion that the RIBA Suffolk Design Review Panel view that the development “*could be a “great addition” to the village of East Bergholt*” is disingenuous, taken out of context of the five pages of criticism and omitting the caveat that the Panel “encouraged the applicant to bring the proposal back to the panel again for review”.
- We trust the Committee will visit the site, but at the very least could take a virtual tour via Google. It is still possible to drive along the A12 and feel that you are in Constable’s Country, the landscape identified anywhere in the world as the quintessential English countryside. Turning off the A12 and approaching via the B1070, the main access point for the majority of visitors and residents alike, you would today still be able to identify it as the same landscape as that in John Constable’s sketchbooks and paintings.
- To further remind oneself of the similarity without the trouble of visiting a gallery simply putting “John Constable Cottage at East Bergholt” into Google provides an excellent example. At the V&A’s recent sell-out exhibition “John Constable – the Making of a Master” the first exhibit the visitor encountered was life size, modern day, projected images of the village of his birth: East Bergholt.

- Martin Roth, V&A Director, in his introduction to the exhibition and its catalogue stated: *By 1893 “A Visit to Constable’s Country” was already on the list of tours organised by Thomas Cook & Son. For many people, John Constable remains a painter synonymous with the British countryside. While some of the scenes he painted have been transformed by development, **others have altered remarkably little since the nineteenth century.**”*
- If for no other reason than pure economics, this application should be refused because it jeopardises the £46,000,000 tourism revenue in the Babergh District in favour of a one off New Homes Bonus and profits to the developer and the landowner.
- To reiterate: East Bergholt is the birthplace of John Constable and site of many of his most famous paintings. It should be the centre of focus for his heritage. We should respect and cherish the legacy that has survived two centuries and ensure it survives for generations to come and we therefore most strongly urge that the application is refused.

Second response received 26 August 2015 (summarised) -

- We object strongly to the proposals to remove mature trees and hedgerows.
- The provision of ‘entry treatment’ with white picket fence, 30mph roundel, dragons teeth and coloured surfacing, further ‘uncontrolled crossing point’, street lighting columns and bus shelter cannot be regarded in any way as improvements and would be suburbanisation of the village.

Further response received 18 November 2015 (summarised) –

- The application should be refused.
- This is a particularly sensitive landscape area. Do not wish to overuse the phrase “Constable’s Country” but feel it important to reiterate that this is not a mythical location.
- This is the landscape that inspired Constable, and where he was born and grew up.
- Object most strongly to the proposal.
- Find no evidence amongst the various revisions recently received that any of their concerns raised in their previous letters, nor those of the Parish Council, have been addressed.
- There are numerous references within the documents to policies which state developments must respect/shape/enhance/conserv e local character/built/natural environment, and respect the scale of communities/character and quality of the landscape, should be well designed in relation to protected areas and most sensitive landscapes, be appropriate to and well integrated into the settlement, be of a high quality and design which respects the local environment in which it is located, particularly the historic context and character.
- These policies are applicable to this site, but cannot see evidence that these have been respected.
- The application is still for a significant suburban estate development which looks like it could be bolted onto the fringes of Ipswich or Colchester.
- The proposal in no way respects, protects, enhances nor conserves the local character, built or natural and historic environment.
- It is not well located and not designed in relation to the landscape. It is an ‘off the shelf’ design.

- Note that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) refers to the site as being included in the Babergh Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- Quotes a letter from the Council's Planning Policy Manager to the Society from 13th December 2010 which states that *"the SHLAA is a technical research document required by Government to demonstrate a 15 year supply of housing land, it is not a policy document, it neither sets policy nor makes any choices. It is not the way the Council puts forward sites for future development"*.
- Points out, therefore, that the inclusion of the site in the SHLAA does not therefore mean that this is a potential site for future development.
- The LVIA does not demonstrate the impacts of the development on the significant views (e.g. superimposed houses) without which it is impossible to judge the impact. It ignores the long view currently enjoyed on the approach to the village.
- No night time "darkness" survey has been undertaken in this largely unlit village.
- Reminds that the EBNP is now at a very advanced stage and due weight must be given to it. The Society is not against all development, but is against this proposed large development on this site, on agricultural land, outside the Built UP Area Boundary.
- Notes that the BDC website could not be accessed on 15 November.

Further response received 22nd June 2017 -

- Would be grateful for assurances that all comments and objections will be taken into account when determining the applications. Still object to the scheme. If the applications 'on hold' were approved then the 5 year housing supply would be on target. Any shortfall is not sufficient justification to overrule the EBNP.
- 5 year land supply - It appears this issue has arisen out of the assertion contained in a report commissioned by two large scale developers into Babergh's 5 year land supply. On the basis of this report, achieved in under two months and with data obtained presumably from Babergh officers as we can find no data which reconciles to the information available on Babergh websites. Babergh's officers appear willing to accept that the Core Strategy 2011-2031, which took years to achieve at considerable expense and is less than one third through its plan period life, is defunct. Babergh's 5 Year Land Supply Interim Statement of April 2017 does not include the fourteen applications regarded as being on hold.
- We could find no reference to the three East Bergholt applications which you are about to be asked to reconsider. If these applications are to be reconsidered they are live and do not contribute to the shortfall in land supply. If these three alone are removed from the shortfall, the suggested shortfall diminishes by 229. If all fourteen held or "disappeared" applications are restored, as they surely must be if you are looking at them, the shortfall is reduced by 674 dwellings. It would appear this would mean the 5 year land supply is on target and would substantially remove the buffering requirement.
- These "disappeared" applications cannot be both taken out of the 5 year land supply whilst, as Lichfield's report for Countryside Properties and Hopkins Homes suggests, being considered for approval because there is a shortfall in the 5 year land supply! We are surprised your legal department would find this an appropriate course of action.

- The 5 Year Land Supply Interim Statement makes reference to the White Paper "Fixing our Broken Housing Market" (February 2017) and uses this as part of the reasoning for reducing the land supply numbers but fails to quote "2.10 The Government also wishes to provide more certainty for those neighbourhoods that have produced plans but are at risk of speculative development because the local planning authority has failed to maintain a five year land supply. Through a Written Ministerial Statement of 12 December 2016, we made clear that where communities plan for housing through a neighbourhood plan, these plans should not be deemed out-of-date unless there is a significant lack of land supply for housing in the wider local authority area."
- It goes on to say "2.11 THE REVISED PLAN WILL ASK NEIGHBOURHOODS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THEIR SITE ALLOCATIONS AND HOUSING POLICIES WILL MEET THEIR SHARE OF HOUSING NEEDS" and concludes by saying THAT NPs WILL BE PROTECTED UNLESS THE LOCAL AUTHORITY FAILS TO DELIVER 25% OF ITS TARGETS IN 2018, 45% IN 2019 and 65% IN 2020. EAST BERGHOLT IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING ITS SHARE OF NEED AND HAS POLICIES AND PLANS IN PLACE TO ACHIEVE THIS. (See Brantham comments below) IT IS CLEAR THE MINISTER'S INTENTION, REGARDLESS OF LAND SUPPLY, IS TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS.
- It is therefore our contention that a) there is not a shortfall and b) if there were, it would not be a reason to overrule the EBNP. Local need/objectively assessed need (OAN) Likewise the report commissioned by Countryside assesses need at an unfathomable number FOUR to FIVE times greater than that carried out by Community Action Suffolk, the body recommended to East Bergholt Parish Council by BDC for the EBNP as part of the evidence base of the EBNP. We are entitled to be cynical.
- Lichfield's are employed by developers whose business is to develop. It would be odd if they did not demonstrate a need for more development. However, we are entitled to believe that our result was achieved without bias and the requirements could not have risen by more than four times in the space of two years. Furthermore, Rebecca Rejzek states on page 2 of her letter re para 119 (of the EBNP and relating to the housing needs survey) "these figures relate just to East Bergholt village and exclude the other 7 villages." This is factually completely INACCURATE.
- The 25-30 affordable units over the EBNP 2011-2031 plan period (see EBNP Appendix D4) were based on a number of scenarios, extrapolated UPWARDS and considering the needs of the functional cluster. In the interests of accuracy, however, with the agreement of Babergh officers, the affordable needs of Brantham, the closest of our hinterland villages (a mere 50 yards from East End) were excluded as substantial development was expected but at a then undetermined time. In addition windfall within the East Bergholt functional cluster was discounted.
- Since the EBNP was made, we would remind you that 333 HOMES IN BRANTHAM NOW HAVE FULL PLANNING PERMISSION and are included in the 5 Year Land Supply Interim Statement as shown on the Housing Trajectory table. However inconvenient for Lichfield's and their report for Countryside, Brantham is part of the East Bergholt functional cluster and these developments in Brantham provide for the affordable needs of the whole cluster. These numbers being into sharp relief the comment in the April Interim 5 Year housing land supply statement which admits there has been an emphasis on rural rather than urban development. It appears that some 70% of the 1050 2011-31 rural housing target has been met or planning granted whilst the urban figure is less than 10%.

- Whilst Brantham has 333 permissions granted, Hadleigh, the home of Babergh, has only 11. We would remind you of the NPPF's sustainability and sequential requirements, which make this rural imbalance a doubtful strategy at best and unsound at worst. Whilst dealing with the assertions of Ms Rezbek, she cites the successful delivery record of Countryside Properties, viz:
 - 1. A new District for the City of Chelmsford (3,700 homes)
 - 2. Mile End, Colchester (1,600)
 - 3. Mariam Park, Bury St Edmund's (1,000)
 - 4. London Road, Braintree (213)
- We would draw your attention to the fact that these are all TOWNS. We, the East Bergholt Parish Council, Action East Bergholt and numerous individual objectors have been pointing out since these applications first surfaced that East Bergholt is NOT A TOWN. It is a VILLAGE.
- These sorts of large scale developments are not appropriate to rural settings. Hills Building Group's application also remains at a size well outside the expressed desires of our community and the Gatton House proposal still fails the tests set by EBNP, Babergh and the NPPF for protecting AONBs.
- With reference to Sharon Smith's addendum of March 28, 2017 para 2 states "The Council is, as acknowledged by the Council, substantially below the 5 Year Land Supply".
- For the reasons already given above, we challenge this assumption, we challenge the numbers which exclude these and the other applications which are actually under consideration, we challenge the complete disregard for the WMS that states Neighbourhood Plans should not be overruled and we challenge all three applications for failing to comply with the NPPF as per our original objections.

Dedham Vale Society

Initial response received 8 July 2015 -

- I write on behalf of the Society to register the strongest possible formal objection to this application.
- Although the precise site of this proposed development lies outside the Dedham Vale AONB it is immediately adjacent to it and, in the considered opinion of the Society, would have a seriously deleterious effect on East Bergholt, one of the most important and historic villages in the AONB. This addition of a large modern Housing Estate (however dressed up that is what it is) would alter the whole balance and ethos of the village. Two passages from the Design and Access Statement we find particularly difficult to accept. At Section 4.0. 5. it is said that *"The large site offers the chance to revitalise an edge of the village with contemporary dwellings of high quality organised in a coherent fashion. The development will provide an improved visible entrance to the village and create spaces reflective and expressive of the historic countryside"* (our italics). From where does the idea that this edge of the village needs "revitalising" come from? Half the charm of many of the villages in the AONB is that they are not "organised in a coherent fashion". We do not accept that a very large Housing Estate dumped on the edge of the village will provide an "improved visible entrance to it". The idea that the development will create spaces reflective and expressive of the historic countryside borders on the preposterous.

At Section 4.2. it is said that “the desire is to create a development which respects the rural sentiment embodied in Constable’s paintings and promotes the character of the village which is picturesque and integrated within his countryside”. We do not accept that this desire is in any way realised by the creation of a large housing estate on a greenfield site on the outskirts of the village of his birth.

- We are also disappointed to find (in the Planning Statement 4.8) that your Council has concluded that “...the proposed development is unlikely to potentially have a significant effect on the environment...” This conclusion does, of course, depend on what you mean by “significant” and “the environment” but we would contend that by any measure the effect on the environment of East Bergholt will be exceptionally significant.
- Our fundamental objection is to the very large size of the proposal. It projects 144 dwellings with 389 bedrooms; allowing for double occupancy of one bedroom in the great majority this would result in an increase of at least 500 in the population of the village, almost 20%. It also projects at least 500 extra vehicles debouching onto the already heavily loaded B1070. While East Bergholt is a “core village” and has a substantial range of services we are somewhat surprised to learn that both the Health and Education authorities consider that this very large influx of new residents can be absorbed within existing provision. Particularly in the case of the Health Centre, already under acute pressure, this seems unrealistic.
- While we understand the pressures on your Council to provide large numbers of new dwellings within the District there is no explanation in the application as to what, if any, other sites were considered before a proposal for so large a number was accepted, even encouraged (there appears to have been extensive consultation with your officers) on a completely agricultural site on the edge of this village. Were brownfield sites eg at Brantham considered?
- The Planning Statement cites the terms of your Core Strategy 11 several times in its support (eg at 8.4. 8.5.) and at 9.2 says “..developments for Core Villages, such as that proposed, will be approved ...if the criteria in Policy CS11 are adhered to”. We contend that the proposal remains seriously contrary to both the spirit and the letter of your own recently issued Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – Rural Development and Core Strategy 11 and to your Core Strategy 15.
- For example the SPD states (at para 12) “The size and scale of the development should be proportionate to the settlement in which it is located” (it can not reasonably be so described).
- “Proposals will need to demonstrate that the development can be accommodated without adversely affecting the character of the Village” (it can not).
- At para 14 it is stated: “...proposals should meet locally identified need” (no evidence is advanced of any local need for an addition of this size).
- Core Strategy 15 states inter alia: proposals “must/should respect the local context and character of the village” (it does not). Further it states: “the scale and nature of the proposal should:
 - Respect the historic assets
 - Make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area
 - It will do neither of these things, indeed rather the reverse.
- We are therefore of the strong opinion that the conclusion at 11.10 of the Planning Statement that the application is “consistent with (inter alia) CS11 and CS15” is entirely incorrect.

- While we accept that the statement at 9.76 of the Planning Statement that the “effect on the Dedham Vale AONB is considered negligible” is correct in purely visual terms it is not so in terms of tranquillity or in the effect it would have on East Bergholt, a most important village within the AONB.
- We most strongly urge your Council to reject this ill-conceived proposal so clearly contrary to your own criteria.

Second response received 9 November 2015 –

- The Dedham Vale Society has now studied this additional material but finds nothing therein which would cause us to change our strong objection registered in our letter of 8 July 2015.
- It remains our view that the proposed development is out of all proportion to the village.
- It would fundamentally and detrimentally alter the nature of this very important settlement within the Dedham Vale AONB.
- It continues to be entirely contrary to your own guidelines as set out in your SPD – Rural Development and Core Strategy 11 and to the terms of Core Strategy 15.

Further response received 25 November 2016 -

- The Society has considered the additional Design Statement dated October 2016 and the Update to the Landscape and Visual Impact Statement referred to in your letter of 17th November 2016. While we were intrigued by the attempt by the Developer to argue that his proposals comply with the East Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan (EBNP) we are entirely unconvinced. His highly selective use of extracts from the plan while predictable does not stand up to a less biased consideration of the whole plan.
- For example he makes no mention of para 4. of EB2 which states in Chapter 3: “Housing Development will be supported..... provided that the development: 4. would be of an acceptable size and scale that contributes to the character of the village.....”
- As we have argued elsewhere it will, if anything, destroy the character of the village rather than contribute to it.
- Arguably the proposal also fails to meet the criteria set out in paras 2. and 5. of EB2. In Chapter 4 of the EBNP Policy EB6 states: “Development proposals shall demonstrate that they: 5. would not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape setting of the village as demonstrated through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.” This is presumably what the Update to the Landscape and Visual Assessment attempts to address. It, however, seems to have ignored paras 135, 136 and 138 of the EBNP which state as follows: “135. It is notable that in consultation in the course of preparation of this plan the characteristic of East Bergholt as “a village not a town” was widely identified as a defining and cherished characteristic. 136. Accordingly whilst appropriate and sustainable development should be encouraged it should not be permitted where it would adversely affect this distinctive character. 138. It should also be noted that there is a significant distance and a clear separation between the northern boundary of the Built Up Area of the village and the A12. This is a contributing factor towards the sense of East Bergholt being a village set apart from urban areas and other infrastructure in a wide agricultural landscape.”

- The Update concludes that the imposition of a large modern housing estate on the land to north west of Moores Lane would have no serious impact on the centre of the village. While this is probably true from the very narrow perspective of the visual landscape it entirely misses the fundamental point that the imposition of so large a number of extra houses on this most important village in the Dedham Vale AONB will alter irretrievably for ever the historic centre.
- The Society was deeply disappointed that your Council decided by a substantial majority to approve this proposal (which remains blatantly contrary to your own criteria set out in your CS11 and the supplementary planning document issued in amplification of that policy) earlier in the year. Noting that formal approval of this decision has not so far been promulgated, we can only hope that this further circulation indicates at least a glimmer of hope that the earlier decision could be revisited before irretrievable damage is done to the village.
- The Society continues to object to the proposal.

Further response received 15 May 2017 -

- Development within the AONB which sets a very dangerous precedent for other applications which seek to nibble away at the AONB on the edge of other villages in the Vale. The Society continues to object to this proposal.

Suffolk Preservation Society

- Represents unsustainable development due to the edge of settlement location on a greenfield site which is highly graded agricultural land.
- Consider that 144 dwellings is disproportionate to the village and the proposed layout includes a number of unsatisfactory design decisions which demonstrate a lack of understanding of the sensitivities and rural context of this site.
- The Society advocates the use of brownfield sites for new housing in advance of greenfield land in line with paras 17 and 111 of the NPPF.
- The Society considers that national planning policy requires that vacant brownfield sites within East Bergholt and its cluster group to be considered for housing development in advance of greenfield sites.
- Policy CS11 requires a sequential approach to site selection. The planning statement justifies the site selection on the basis that there are no brownfield sites within or abutting the village that could accommodate development of this size. The Society suggests that this is not justification to build 144 dwellings, business and community buildings, on the application site, but leads to the conclusion that a number of smaller developments elsewhere within the cluster of villages would be preferable.
- At 144 dwellings, this development will constitute a significant increase in the number of households in East Bergholt (which includes East End). The application does not demonstrate a need for this number of houses.
- For the village to grow sustainably it would be preferable for smaller developments to be added incrementally over the Plan period to allow the existing services and infrastructure to absorb the increased demand. The Society considers that one large development on a peripheral site, as proposed, is too large a development to be successfully incorporated into the village community and would urge small incremental schemes to allow for sustainable growth.

- The site consists of 8.4 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land. The planning statement erroneously states that grade 2 land does not constitute best and most versatile agricultural land, whereas it is.
- Good quality agricultural land is a finite resource and this site is open, relatively level and part of a larger holding. It is therefore suitable for cultivation in its own right and as part of a larger parcel.
- The planning statement fails to demonstrate that land of poorer quality is not available for development within Babergh, contrary to para 112 of the NPPF.
- It would have been more appropriate to set the development line back from the highway and incorporate a wider planting belt in order to provide a softer edge to the built up area, in line with that opposite.
- The application lacks consideration of character areas and how these respond to individual characteristics of the site. The proposed layout seems largely uniform in its approach.
- The three 'avenues' lack the design sensitivities of a rural development and fail to include street tree planting which is a key element of an avenue.
- There is a lack of thought given to the streetscape layout, and no clear public realm strategy.
- The general approach to highway design fails to provide any consideration for controlling vehicle speeds.
- Many of the frontages are arranged in awkward fashion.
- On street parking spaces dominate the streetscene to an unacceptable level in numerous locations, compromising the open space and suggesting the site is overdeveloped.
- Car parking has been designed without consideration for the end users or the functionality of the development. The design of the parking courts makes them unattractive to use, without passive surveillance and very limited in space.
- The proposals fail to adequately mitigate against the negative impact the development will have on the rural location.
- Landscaping along the northern boundary is sparse, which is a vitally important boundary to screen views into the site.
- Landscaping along the north eastern boundary is within private gardens, removing any control the local authority has over it.
- The Society expects that due weight will be given to the EBNP.

James Cartlidge MP

Letter received 21 July 2015 (summarised) –

- Does not intend to comment on applications as standard.
- It is worth noting that I have already expressed my opinion in public prior to the election at a public meeting at the Lambe School in East Bergholt, and that I will express an opinion where I think a matter of policy is at stake.
- In this case, is concerned about one key area of policy – CS11 – and the matter of 'proportionate' development.
- Understands why the policy would not want to prescribe mathematical values for proportionality, this is about judgement.
- The word character (within the policy) is also clearly subject to interpretation rather than exact definition.
- There are question marks about many of the services in East Bergholt and how they would cope, the substandard A12 junctions, a surgery in special measures etc).

- The real question is over the word 'character'. CS11 is a policy designed to add flexibility in rural development, so that more development can come forward rather than none at all, but that the intention is nevertheless to preserve as far as possible the character of our villages and avoid singularly large numbers of houses to be added in a short period.
- Has recently visited East Bergholt's primary and secondary schools and its medical practice, and discussed the A12 junctions at length with Highways England.
- Every time has paused at the site to consider the vista at Moores Lane, I cannot believe that the addition of 144 homes in one singular estate is in keeping with a policy that supports proportionate development defined as being in character with the existing settlement.
- If 144 dwellings was felt to be proportionate, I can see nothing in the policy that would prevent the landowner immediately applying to add further houses up to a similar scale which by definition would therefore be proportionate (in relation to the newly enlarged settlement).
- The only protection against this seems to be ensuring that the development itself is of a number that can be absorbed into the village without a singular large scale addition of new homes. Suggests that there may be a policy weakness here that merits further long-term consideration.
- This is not to suggest for one minute that East Bergholt does not need some new housing. I have noted there are very few properties for sale and what is would be well out of affordability reach of most younger families based in the area and wanting to buy their first home or trade up.
- I detect widespread realism that some new housing is required to support the long-term viability of the village, but that overwhelmingly the feeling is that this should be proportionate.
- This is the view that I share and I believe is the principle underpinning CS11 – to bring forward sustainable growth of housing in villages, not singular impositions of disproportionately large estates.
- It may be argued that some of the strategic sites on the edge of our towns (Sudbury, Cornard, Ipswich/Pinewood etc) are adding a similar percentage of homes to that in East Bergholt, but there is a strong argument those developments would not change the character of the towns.
- A similar percentage in a village can have a far more dramatic effect.
- Ultimately South Suffolk is a predominantly rural constituency and even its towns take much of their character from their harmony with the surrounding rurality.
- We could see a sharp increase in development in our villages that changes the character of the constituency to a more urban feel – this is my primary policy concern and I believe that the development should be rejected on grounds of disproportionality, notwithstanding other concerns which may or may not come forward.

Ward Member Response – Cllr Hinton

- I liken the application for this development to a colander. It is full of holes and is mainly comprised of miss quotes from policy documents, and inaccurate information ranging across all aspects of the application.

- During the course of this letter of objection I will highlight the main points and how I feel they relate to planning policy and I will not try to identify ALL the “holes” as this would take too much time. It was Richard Watson the former Head of Planning at Babergh who said that “a few good reasons are better than a multitude of less important ones”!
- Furthermore it does not demonstrate that it complies with or has made any allowance for the content of the Localism Act or will enable the Planning Authority to comply with the Duty to Co- Operate provisions.
- Planning Statement: The statement is full of errors and contains the repeated presumption that the Babergh Core Strategy says that all development should be in the core villages as they have demonstrated their ability to provide the services for sustainable living. The policy within the Core Strategy highlights the “cluster” nature of the rural areas and in my opinion is worded to insure even distribution of development and not to exclude any village from the potential need for housing. This is why it stated that development in the cluster villages should bear a direct connection to the facilities in the core villages, not that it could only be in the core villages. If we assume that the “need” stated in the proposal is accurate and not 5 years out of date and recording a “desire” rather than actual need, then to put all the homes in the Core Village would deny the evidence base for the hinterland villages to have any development at all and effectively condemn them to die.
- This proposal is therefore contrary to CS11 on all the six subsections to the policy.
- The NPPF underpins the presumption of development approval unless it is contrary to its precepts. The policy is based upon sustainable development that is work related and appropriately located and avoids the use of prime agricultural land.
- The proposed site is quoted as grade 2 agricultural lands, some of the most productive and therefore it should be protected. The developer argues that as there is no brownfield land and other sites, (possibly on less productive land) have not been offered, so the retention of productive agricultural land should be set aside. The developer further states that the “business units” four B1 units totalling 360sq.m should be pre-let prior to construction, so essentially this proposal has no job creation / long term employment element at all, but is purely houses, necessitating commuting, situated on productive agricultural land in the countryside! Another sound reason for refusal, as the proposals fails to meet the requirements of NPPF and Babergh policies. Just because there have been no alternatives offered, does not mean that policies should be set aside. They should look for alternative sites elsewhere, which will not run contrary to the policies.
- The planning statement quotes the identified need for dwellings suitable for older residents to be able to downsize and therefore remain in the village as their health and mobility fade. This was identified from the community consultation, but other more significant points, concerning location size and proportionality have been ignored. There has been selective and token notice paid to “community consultation”.
- Presumably that is why the “bungalows” are situated at the far northern fringe of the proposed development making them the furthest from village facilities of any of the proposed homes.
- Layout and mix of housing is incompatible with any perceived or actual housing need and therefore is a reason for refusal.

- I am sure that the eminent design members of the Suffolk Design Panel live in Holland which is why the design of the individual properties mirrors those found in Holland rather than a Suffolk village! Refusal on in appropriate design is therefore appropriate. The comments by a renowned architect concentrate on the high roofs a characteristic of most Dutch dwellings. Yes there are some high roof dwellings in the village, but to extract a selection of the variety of dwellings and styles that have evolved across the village over hundreds of years is not a sound way of justifying inappropriate and haphazard design for the development.
- Local knowledge and awareness of the community and how it operates is crucial to the sympathetic and appropriate scale of development that is so widely required across the country. The applicant I am sure knows where his site is, but does not appreciate the character and layout of the village. Distances to facilities have been stated that are in excess of the NPPF guidelines for foot traffic thus encouraging unsustainable car use, street lights are proposed but under CS11 they are not required on footways and the original assumption was to give communities without street lights the option of not having them installed on new proposals. Streetlights are often a requirement of the County Council as the Highways Authority, to facilitate adoption of new developments, but there is a conflict of standards when County Councils are also seeking to turn off lights to save on funding! To require them or propose to add them to an already “dark” village seems incompatible with many other policies!
- Community services are over stated in the proposals. There are NO facilities for teenagers whereas the proposals talk about a church group! The Doctors / Medical practice is in “special measures” with the CQC and was close to closure, but there are no alternatives as surrounding practices have refused to take any more East Bergholt transfers. There is a separate chemist shop which provides an excellent service, but not one in the surgery as quoted in the Planning statement! Schools are quoted as having capacity especially the Primary school, but local residents already have children in alternative locations as there was not sufficient space when they requested it! The local shop requested a planning approval for an extension to facilities, later withdrawn. In summary facilities are available, but they are currently near the limit of their capacity and this is not reflected in the proposals. CIL in theory should fund facilities, but is likely to be accumulated for use in urban areas as the funds locally will be deemed too small.
- Para 5.10 to 5.12 are flawed in that they talk of growth, jobs and prosperity. This proposal has no jobs, will grow commuter traffic, only further stretching the already overloaded infrastructure, and by making the national economy even more reliant on imported foodstuffs, (we currently import more than 50% of our essential foodstuffs for the first time ever, government figures) because of the loss of agricultural land and will create an unsustainable wart on the approaches to a nationally recognised village in an area that already contributes extensively to the tourism budget of the UK.
- Justification for the affordable / social homes has been mentioned in para 7.3 but what it ignores is the fact that the Ipswich Housing Market area is influenced by the Ipswich Policy Area and this does not include East Bergholt! If we are to extend the area of involvement we should perhaps include the Greater Haven Housing Area which is covered by the choice based letting system and thus place these houses somewhere in North Essex perhaps in the area where neighbouring councils are planning 51,500 new homes in the A120 corridor, 1050 of which are already identified some 2 miles away just across the border. Where is the “need” when they are built?

- Babergh District Councils own 2008 Housing needs survey is quoted, but in relation to the total migration though “desire” rather than “need” to live in the Councils area.
- The latest Suffolk wide Housing “needs” Survey, having only achieved a 5% return on all homes is deemed as not robust enough to judge the evidence for “need” in East Bergholt. There is therefore no identified evidence to support the proposal within the submitted documents, but the local Neighbourhood Plan research shows no “need” on this scale, but a “desire” for development on a modest scale over the course of the District Councils Local Plan period.
- Comparing proportions of rented accommodation in villages to towns assumes there is a similar level of employment which is not the case. This is therefore a flawed assessment and can be set aside. The recent completion of 4 “affordable” bungalows for “local needs” occupancy had difficulty in complying with the planning constraints, thus there is not a proven “need” to fill 50 affordable homes!
- Para 9.4 means nothing so an explanation of what is actually meant would be useful!
- This proposal is contrary to both local and National planning policy on several grounds and is inaccurate in many respects and the proposal should be refused. The detailed responses of both the Parish Council and the Action group clearly state the planning reasons for refusal. To continue to pick apart this flawed proposal would only potentially confuse the issue and is in my opinion unnecessary.
- Attached are example of errors inaccuracies and potential misinterpretations and representations within the proposals.

Dedham Vale Society – Development within the AONB which sets a very dangerous precedent for other applications which seek to nibble away at the AONB on the edge of other villages in the Vale. The Society continues to object to this proposal.

East Bergholt Society – Would be grateful for assurances that all comments and objections will be taken into account when determining the applications. Still object to the scheme. If the applications ‘on hold’ were approved then the 5 year housing supply would be on target. Any shortfall is not sufficient justification to overrule the EBNP.