

## **Parish Council Open Day Sat 4 July at the Lambe School.**

(59 visitors all with CO7 postcodes, plus 5 Parish Councillors)

**Here are the written comments made on Saturday (in random order): I've copied them verbatim, which seems more respectful to the parishioners who contributed:**

- *Are there any bungalows on the overall plan? There is a 2 bed and a 3 bed on the individual plans. A serious risk joining the A12 is increased by the number of cars that will be trying to enter this dangerous road.*
- Travel – walking and cycling to and from the site – assessment totally wishful thinking.
- *Whilst acknowledging that more new housing is necessary I object to this planned development for the following reasons:- i) Scale of 144 houses as one mass is completely out of proportion to the size of the village as it stands. ii) Traffic congestion that will be a consequence a) in the village centre as many will drive given the development is not within the village ring, b) on the B1070 which is already a busy road, c) joining the A12 both towards Ipswich and Colchester and which have insufficient 'run-on' roadway. iii) Cars reversing onto B1070 will cause danger from the houses that front onto the main road. iv) Pedestrians walking down Gaston St, where there are no pathways, will be in danger. v) East Bergholt is a village, not a town, and the outcome of our Neighbourhood Plan is known, albeit not lodged.*
- We strongly object to the proposed development: i) The development fails to meet key criteria set out in CS11 including its impact on the landscape, environment and local heritage, ii) Assimilating a development of this scale, at the same time, is simply not sustainable, iii) To allow this application would utterly undermine the emerging Neighbourhood Plan where the wishes of respondents clearly express a desire for small scale residential development.
- *Strong belief that we need affordable (as in low cost market) houses so local East Bergholt residents not on big salaries can afford to buy/rent a house and stay in the village. As well as commuters, we need to provide for younger, less well off, residents.*
- A good thing would be for the Council to suggest everybody who is anti this development should put on their gateway a note saying NO!

- *I object to this application on the following grounds: Proportionality: too many houses in one place at one time. Would create a virtual satellite. Need: the need for such a large development is not demonstrated nor justified. See EBNP questionnaire and Housing Needs Survey. Landscape: although outside the AONB this site permits a 'long view' approach to the village. 'Constable's Country' is still recognisable today, but an addition of this type of development could be bolted on to any urban settlement. It would completely and irrevocably alter the major approach to the village. Bidwell's statement acknowledges this but does not in any way show in what way this scheme has been designed to accommodate the fragility and importance of the landscape. It would in no way 'enhance', only destroy.*
- i) Totally against such a large build. We believe that properties should be built in smaller packets (15-20 max) over the period to allow the village to absorb them, ii) When the interim travel plan was produced it states that there are two trains an hour to both London and Norwich, but it does not take into consideration the parking of private vehicles at the station. At present the car park is unable to cope with what we consider to be normal; an extra 50 – 100 vehicles will make parking impossible, iii) Junctions on to the A12 from B1070 are already dangerous, an increase in the number of vehicles using these junctions is very likely to cause even more accidents. Builds in Brantham and Manningtree are likely to exacerbate this situation.
- *Concentrating on Safety: Traffic from Brantham already uses the B1070 to reach the A12. With the additional developments in Manningtree and Lawford this traffic is bound to increase. The Moores Lane development will probably add another 200 or more cars using this road. The B1070 will be busy – perhaps dangerously.*
- i) Junctions to A12 poor – visibility bad esp to Colchester, ii) More traffic will be generated through the village – people will drive rather than walk to shop/school – there are already problems with parking around these areas and the roads surrounding at peak times especially. Some of the proposed development will be at least 2 car families causing more traffic along an already busy road – some driveways seem to go directly onto the B1070 and there appear to be three roads onto it – poor visibility along sections, iii) Village infrastructure: schools full, surgery can't cope with patients it has, can the sewer system cope? iv) This large development will extend the village envelope leading to further expansion. Sites within the village have been identified which would be suitable for the smaller

more acceptable developments which would add up to the number required to be developed over the 'core villages' by Babergh. There is no need to have such a large development in one area and in one hit. Smaller developments over a longer period of time would be more acceptable and affect the 'village feel' less. v) The development mentions business units – there are already empty units in at least two parts of the village. I suspect these units are on the plan to enable a box to be ticked on the planning application and that they will be missed even though they may help with the application. vi) The development seems to be a 'spur' on the outside of the village – the people will commute – Manningtree Station carpark is already full and the road to it busy, vii) The land is 'green field' at the moment meaning the village is surrounded by fields not one directly onto the A12 and linked directly with the surrounding villages. There are brown field sites available, rather than using 'green lungs', viii) East Bergholt is a village with a village 'feel', atmosphere and identity. Smaller developments may be more acceptable – this large one would not, ix) Looking again at the drawings there doesn't seem to be any houses suitable for the elderly, bungalows, etc. The ridge heights are higher than the heights in other houses in the village – can they be reduced? x) Two storey properties with lower rooflines, perhaps low level 1½ storey buildings but no higher – how many storeys are the apartments? xi) The business units are in very prominent position and dominate the entrance to our village and the new development.

- *Comments on CS11: Local Need – not identified. Development – not part of a 'walk' neighbourhood. Secondary school – full. Sewage system – not adequate (Gaston St main sewer gets blocked). Cars from this new estate constitute a traffic hazard to the illegal junctions on to the A12. Safety in the village sacrificed because of the 'Housing Premium' income to Babergh. Village to lose its identity and become a dormitory area of London.*
- We strongly object to this inappropriate planning application. The numbers involved are disproportionate to the village as it exists. Our concerns are that existing facilities will be overstretched trying to cope with the increased number of people living here. Whilst saying that the schools can just erect more porta cabin classrooms to cope, we all know the reality of that. Are teachers readily available to employ to give the adequate teaching? Will the doctors be able to cope? How long will we have to wait to get an appointment? Also, as the plans stand, has anyone considered adequate parking for visitors? Some houses have only one allocated parking space. What happens when, say, two children want a car? The roads will be clogged up.

- *In principal we are not opposed to it. We have a shortage of quite “rightly?” people want somewhere to live. 144 in one go – more than is ideal I think. That said the spread between “affordable and “market” looks good, as it the split between 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 bed properties.*

*My main concern is impact of traffic on the B1070, particularly going past the High School & definitely the 4 sister’s junction. I think we will have to have traffic calming along the road (humps, pelican crossing near the High School). I notice 3 exits off the estate on to the B1070. I think that is good, rather than only 1. But there are many driveways directly off the B1070 as well?*

*Impact on schools, a positive one I think. Some years recently the Primary School has only 22 /23 pupils in classes. This should help in the Primary Scholl’s future. High School – less possibly will be able to coach in from out of catchment, i.e. Essex or Pinewood / Chantry.*

*Impact on our pubs / shops – again positive as should make them more profitable and therefore remain open.*

*Re the 4 sisters, I think there is a real issue / danger re traffic going London Bound. Can we take the opportunity to request this is looked at / improved?*