

Hartest Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-Submission Draft dated March 2017:
Objection (Amended: 8 March 2017)

Declaration: I have no personal development interests whatsoever in the outcome of the Neighbourhood Plan.

I object to the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted. I refer to the Core Strategy Policy CS11 and the supporting criteria as well as Neighbourhood Plan Objectives (1): Protect and enhance the landscape... and (2): Protect and enhance the historic environment. However I do not see that these policies/objectives are secured in the spatial proposals of the Neighbourhood Plan.

In particular I consider that there is an imbalance in the intended spatial distribution of development as proposed by the 'clusters'. It seems clear that the focus of future housing provision should be close to the centre of the village for the following compelling reasons:

1. All of the significant community facilities (the school, the community hall, the pub, the GP surgery, the church, the remaining shop, the principal public open space) are located centrally in the village of Hartest.
2. The historic pattern of development is that of a nucleated settlement around a central green. Maintaining this pattern would require that future growth is likewise concentrated centrally.

The BUAB is tightly drawn around the existing village so as to constrain development and it is contended that additional housing in close proximity to this would be detrimental to the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings. As a consequence growth 'clusters' have been identified with the largest being a loosely drawn envelope around the hamlet of Cross Green apparently ignoring the fact that the hamlet is also in a conservation area and includes a number of listed buildings and the Special Landscape Area (i.e. it is no different the core village in this respect). The envelope is drawn to encompass potentially relatively extensive sites and is stretched south to incorporate the tennis courts of the isolated dwelling known as The Warrens (convenient in terms of the development aspirations of one of the NP Group members but otherwise a curious boundary which may raise a question of probity). In sum this represents the major part of proposed potential development sites in the parish over the plan period so that growth would be directed here. I would suggest that

(a) To maintain the historic settlement pattern the hamlets / existing settlement clusters should be allocated growth in proportion with that allocated to the core village. Further, in order to maintain the sense of identity of the hamlet of Cross Green (and simultaneously the village of Hartest) afforded by the existing landscape then infilling between the hamlet and the village should be avoided (i.e. the growth area should not extend southwards as shown). In support of this point I would refer to the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment which states that for 'Undulating Ancient Farmland':

“parishes in this landscape tend to consist of multiple clusters of varying sizes. The release of land for development should, if at all possible, reflect the local pattern.”

(b) To be more sustainable, growth should actually be concentrated in the core village (sad to report but, not infrequently, residents of Cross Green use cars to access village services) so placing more housing in the hamlet at a distance from the services is less sustainable than allocating a higher proportion in the core village.

(c) Placing development on land of a lower elevation (i.e. the core village) would help minimise its impact on the wider landscape by reducing the visual envelope.

It is of course possible to have development in proximity to a conservation area and/or listed building that does not detract from the historic asset although it would require a higher standard of design than seems to have been accepted of late. However, in general, I consider that the existing Local Plan provides a more balanced approach to development than does the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan
Date: 7 March 2017 at 16:36
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Nic

I was most impressed by the professional way the Neighbourhood Plan was presented and many thanks to you and your Committee for all your hard work.

I particularly support your emphasis on not spoiling the beautiful countryside with unsympathetic out-of-scale development and retaining views and the rural nature of Hartest. Sadly certain areas at the top and bottom of Hartest Hill start to look rather suburban caused as much by inappropriate landscaping and lighting as by the buildings.

However if I may comment specifically on the '*Defined Cluster*' in the Conservation area around Fosters Farmhouse which I was told may be considered for development. My cottage, Claycott, sits bang in the middle of this area and would be most affected. I have no problem with existing barns and outbuildings converted into accommodation but new houses in the paddocks and gardens adjoining my property would in my view be totally unsuitable.

Depending in where it was sited, such development could adversely affect my views, peace and calm, enjoyment of my property and its value. Parking outside Claycott is already very unsatisfactory bordering on dangerous and further development could make the situation worse.

The other houses in this cluster are all cushioned by large grounds. I do not have such a large garden and therefore new buildings close to my boundary could affect me far more than the other three properties.

Already the nearby area around Mill House has become quite suburban with all the new building. The Fosters cluster with its listed historic houses, barns and moats remains delightfully rural Suffolk and I would not wish to see this compromised as along the road.

I should be most grateful if my views could be included in your consultation process.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Saturday 18th March 2017

Re: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Nick

Following the Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation at The Institute on Friday 3rd March 2017, I am writing to express my grave concerns over the proposals for the future development of our village.

At the very outset of this project I expressed concerns when I attended a village walk lead by [REDACTED]. During this walk it was emphasised to me that there was no intention of 'pinpointing' sites as potential development opportunities and that it was 'merely a walk to ascertain which aspects of the village were important to protect'.

Having now studied the documents in detail and attended your consultation evening, The Neighbourhood Plan committee have indeed confirmed my fears. Despite protestations to the contrary by [REDACTED] at this evening, in ringing the cluster at the top of Hartest Hill there is clearly only one site that could be developed, so you may as well have put a flag in the middle of it! The implications of this proposal are many.

- The area marked is adjacent to a Grade two listed building, and opposite another, both of which hold great historical value. Given the struggles that both properties endured in obtaining planning permission to extend, I would have thought it unlikely that permission would be granted under curtilage of these buildings anyway. This location is also contradictory to your own guidance as [REDACTED] stressed to me at the meeting, that the land to the South of Brega could not be developed as it was located opposite a listed building - Pippin Cottage.
- The Neighbourhood Plan is ignoring its own documentation, which clearly states 'Permission would not be granted where development would have an inverse impact on the environment or highway safety'. The location to which I refer is on a blind bend on what is primarily a single-track lane. Surely this creates an inverse impact on highway safety?
- In pinpointing pockets of land you are effectively writing landowners a blank cheque in terms of land value as it is instantly turned from garden or pastureland into a building plot, which obviously increases its value immensely.
- Hartest Hill, right through Shimpling Road to Giffords Hall is already in a terrible mess. This has been worsened since the weight restriction on the bridge was lifted some four years ago. The ditches and drainage are blocked and cannot cope. The road is crumbling into the ditches and potholes are becoming bigger and deeper. The verges are now mud baths where vehicles cannot pass and each new dwelling could bring an additional 4 vehicles to an area that is already under too much

pressure. The road is now eating into front gardens by over a foot in some places. Indeed, in response to your own questionnaire 31 out of 37 people agree that grass verges should be protected on narrow roads, so surely development outside of the built up area will only add to this problem?

- There are no footpaths for residents to walk safely to the amenities within the village, or for children to walk safely to and from school from either of the marked areas at the top of Hartest Hill.
- Parking is already an issue here; cars are parked on the road and in lay-bys thus making the road even more dangerous. In addition, cars are now being parked on field entrances.

For these reasons alone, three of the four sites suggested by your committee appear totally illogical.

Planning permission for two significant developments has recently been refused at two sites in the village (Springfield and Lawshall Road). Having studied the documentation on the Babergh website this is primarily because of:-

- a) Access via a single track lane (same applies to Cross Green and Shimpling Road)
- b) Proximity to listed buildings (same applies to Cross Green and Shimpling Road)
- c) Drainage being unable to cope (same applies to Cross Green and Shimpling Road).
- d) Important views across open countryside (same applies to Cross Green and Shimpling Road).

In my opinion, future development should take place within, or as close as possible to, the defined built up area. This would be common sense for a number of reasons.

- 1) The road is a far more substantial two-way road that could cope with extra traffic.
- 2) Village amenities (Dr's, School, Institute, Pub, Butchers, Garage, Bus Stops) are all within easy reach.
- 3) There are paths to accommodate pedestrians safely.

I am not convinced that this has been a democratic process using sensible logic with the villages good future truly at heart.

To my mind, there are a number of far more suitable sites to those recommended by your group. Would it not be logical to work with people that are already looking to develop on their land and find a suitable compromise rather than 'earmark' sites where the landowner has not considered development?

Other areas of the Plan I have concerns about are:-

- The Pub Green space. I fail to see how you can influence a privately owned green space in the village. I am unsure how the garden at the pub is different to any other garden in the village. Will the same rules apply? If so, I would suggest that the land marked at Fosters could be deemed as an equally important green space. The pub is run as a business and the village have no financial investment in it, and therefore, surely have no say in its future.

- The future of the businesses in the village (The Garage and Butchers) is down to their individual owners. It is not for you or I to tell them how they should run their business, and they should not have to financially justify themselves to your committee if they no longer wish to do so.

Finally, I would like to bring to your attention that the approach taken by one of your committee members, [REDACTED] on the consultation evening was offensive. When debating the pros and cons of the Neighbourhood Plan he became incredibly argumentative and confrontational. At one point (when trying to discuss alternative locations around the village) I was confronted with 'do you like Glemsford and want Hartest to end up like it? Perhaps you should go and live there then'! Followed by 'and you know what that is like as you used to live there!' This leaves me questioning the validity of the entire process where such narrow-minded views are imposed upon others, particularly from someone so new to the village.

The following day at the Hartest Farmers Market, [REDACTED] told me 'where he told me I was welcome to put my thoughts in writing, but suspected that I was not going to like the reply I would receive. This leaves me wishing to question the transparency of the committee, as it would suggest that decisions have already been made and that the consultation process is pointless.

I very much look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
Date: 26 March 2017 at 11:02
To: [REDACTED]

R4

SA

Dear Nick

I arrived at the meeting on the 3rd March with an open mind, but left feeling frustrated and offended.

During the evening I mainly had a conversation with [REDACTED] he was very quick to point out reasons why development could not take place in certain areas but couldn't or wouldn't give reasons why the clusters were a better option. I am not sure if his views were personal or those of the committee I suspect a combination of both.

When he was asked "would smaller houses be built within the clusters" he replied "3 to 4 bedroom properties or bigger would be ideal". I feel this is totally unacceptable as surely there is a need for smaller properties for the village to thrive.

I feel very frustrated that sites within the main core of the village have been overlooked for totally unsuitable ones in the proposed clusters. Three of the four areas proposed have no pedestrian access to the village and two of them are outside the preferred maximum walking distance to public transport.

As two of the areas Mill House and Fosters are on the Shimpling Road, I feel any future development in these areas will be unsuitable because; road and verges are already unable to cope with the volume of traffic, (CS11 VI many country lanes are susceptible to damage by increased traffic), on road parking is an issue now, ongoing drainage problems causing Whistlers to almost flood last summer, proximity to listed buildings.

Within the Neighbourhood Plan there are several references for a village shop still to be needed. As the garage site has been mentioned (if ever it became available) as a potential site for a shop surely this is another reason why

development should take place nearer to the centre of the village and not in the clusters.

At the end of the evening I was extremely offended by a comment made by [REDACTED] I asked him "why a certain site was not suitable?" and his reply was "if this area was developed Hartest would start to look like Glemsford and if you like Glemsford that much you should go and live there!"

As I have always lived within two miles of where I do now I feel he has no right to make such an outrageous comment when he is a relative newcomer to the village. I feel someone who expresses such opinions has no place on a committee that is shaping the future of the village.

Best regards



Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Hardest draft neighbourhood plan "Hardest 2036"
Date: 13 May 2017 at 10:48
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

We are writing regarding the above plan.

Our comments on the proposals are identified in the document headed, COMMENT ON THE HARDEST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN "HARDEST 2036", already forwarded to you by [REDACTED]

Other comments about the draft plan are as follows:

We are concerned that it could appear that some members of the parish council or the committee working to draw up the plan, on behalf of the council, may have some self interest in the current proposals being approved.

It is important that village residents are able to see documentary evidence that council and committee members have disclosed an interest where appropriate, that expected codes of conduct for parish councils have been followed to ensure objectivity and probity and that there are no procedural irregularities.

We would expect that all the above has already been considered as part of the accountability and corporate governance of the parish council. It would be helpful to have clarity about the above before the village plan is considered further.

Your sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Hartest neighbourhood Plan
Date: 18 May 2017 at 18:43
To: [REDACTED]

R11

MC



Commenting on Document Hartest Neighbourhood Plan
Specifically HAR 11
Dear Nick,

Regarding local potential building clusters as depicted within the Hartest Neighbourhood plan and namely related to protection of important views from public vantage points, I would like it to be noted that I believe my immediate environment should be classed as just this. At the start of Pilgrims lane one is afforded (facing East) a much commented on and photographed view by numerous ramblers, perhaps the best view along Pilgrims Lane! The move to my current address some five years ago was decided upon because of this view and the prospect of a potential cluster build is causing me great concern. Might I therefore respectfully request that my comments regarding this protection of important views be conveyed to all parties whom might have a "say so" in the local development. Thank you for your attention in this matter and I would most appreciate confirmation of receipt of my feelings. Additionally, I will forward to you, some pictures of the said view.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Comments
Date: 19 May 2017 at 23:35
To: [REDACTED]

R12/R13

DC

Full Names:
Residents - [REDACTED]

Firstly we would like to express our appreciation for the significant work that has gone into preparing the plan and engaging the village with it - clearly a major undertaking. Here are a few last minute comments!

Broadly we support the stated objectives of the Plan. Reading this draft it seems that there is a desire to formulate a pre-emptive accommodation with Babergh and Government designed objectives. It is clearly desirable to work alongside the planning agencies, but that will not always be possible. 'Built-up' in the context of Hartest is very much a relative term! Having experience of areas that are truly built up, we fear that there is a danger of underestimating the pressures driving development that would definitely be inappropriate - forces that need to be firmly resisted. The Plan should be absolutely unequivocal in protecting amenity woodland and green field sites within the Conservation Area.

The balance of comment in the Plan seems heavily weighted towards the static components of developments - buildings and views. Perhaps more could be said about the infrastructure and traffic generated by additional housing. It is not unrealistic to assume that any new household will come with at least one car per person, and the cumulative impact of this factor is bound to be negative in the context of the village.

The concept of clusters seems a little elastic in some places. In the case of the Pear Tree Farm cluster which seems to comprise three dwellings (four if you count the shack by the lake), we are not sure if that is of sufficient density to be deemed a cluster. Moreover, circling on the Proposals Map is misleading where it goes over into the field and wooded areas around the Cross Green cluster.

Although economic growth seems like an attractive proposition, in practice it tends to mean industrialisation and property speculation - neither of which we would welcome. As the shape of all rural communities is being redrawn we would want to see a very cautious approach to any plans that sacrificed the tranquility or character of the village for putative future economic benefits that may never materialise, or indeed stay in the village.

Additionally:

8.12 - We support SLA extension

9.2 Recent (postwar) buildings not aging well. New developments should be more heterogenous and sympathetic design and materials, but unfortunately with more 'affordable' schemes these will be the first two things to go.

9.6 Underground cabling we support.

9.8 We support taking initiative if new appraisal not forthcoming

Best regards

[REDACTED]

Hartest Neighbourhood Plan - comment

Question 1: [REDACTED]

Question 2: private individual

Question 3: Live in Hartest

Question 4-6: as indicated

General comment

1. The Plan has much in its favour, in particular
 - a. the emphasis it places on the special character (conservation area and heritage aspects) of Hartest, and,
 - b. the importance of the special views into and from the village and its outlying clusters.
2. Whilst the Neighbourhood plan positions itself within the Babergh District Local Plan should there not be reference to the relevant parts of the NPPF as the over-arching framework.
3. Hartest is a hinterland village- it always will be; more significantly it will never be a centre of employment.
4. The emphasis on limited development is paramount – individual or small clusters (2-3 houses): NOT an estate. The current infrastructure (roads and sewerage in particular) are further limiting factors.
5. The major attraction of Hartest is its historic buildings and special views as epitomised by The Green and its surrounding houses; Hartest does not need to grow.

Specific points

1. **Para 6.8** Pear Tree Farm cluster – this is predominantly farm buildings; development adjacent to these may not be the most appealing. However, if the farm buildings became redundant then as a brown field site it may be appropriate for a limited development.
2. **Para 7.2** Why were the years 2007-2015 chosen for the statistic of 11 new homes in the eight-year period? The Banham Yard development of 4 houses in this short time window will have elevated the average. It is likely that the underlying trend is less than 1 new house per year with occasional blips (Green View estate and Banham's Yard). This seems a more appropriate growth rate for a small hinterland village.
3. **Para 7.8** "...the Core Strategy does not identify the minimum number of homes that Hartest should contribute to the overall need". In other words, there is no requirement to build any houses in Hartest to satisfy the Babergh Local Plan.
4. **Para 7.9** and fig 7.2 – it would be surprising if the number of young people (16-24) were to increase as many will move away for employment or further education (the 2011 census was during university term). Hartest is a relatively remote village and as such it is not surprising that there is an older retired demography.
5. **Para 7.9** Local housing needs. This seems to be a list of wishes rather than needs. How many of the respondents absolutely need to live in Hartest. Hartest will never again be a major centre of employment; to that end there is no requirement ('need') to have a local work force. The 2011 census identified that the majority of the working residents commute to a place of work outside Hartest.
6. Given that there is limited real need by anyone to live in Hartest, the desire to live here is as valid for all residents, current and new, retired or otherwise.
7. The need for more houses is most cited by developers and others with an interest in housing stock – actually it fulfils their needs more than it does the village!
8. **P19 CS11 point (v)** – is there really a need for a village shop or is this a fanciful wish! Even with community volunteer staffed it is unlikely to be viable. There will be a limited customer base for a limited range of expensive items compared to the shops in the nearby towns. Local delivery of milk and papers together with on-line shopping will more than cater for residents without transport.
9. **Fig 8.2** – an absurd use of relative vertical to horizontal scale for the geography of the area!

Readability

Up to and including p15 the letter spacing and word spacing in particular is very variable to non-existent exacerbated by random use of left and full justification.

e.g. several randomly selected 'snapshots':

CoreStrategyrecognisesthatthereareanumberoflarger identifyingitasa'
Itisconsideredtheexistingsettlementpatterncontributes

Errata

P26: 7.4 ..." One third of the population is aged over 60 and there is a relatively small proportion that are aged 16 to 44 despite the presence of a primary school in the village." – From the bar chart this should read 16 to 24?

20th May 2017

RESPONSE TO HARTEST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (PRE- SUBMISSION DRAFT)

Q1 Name of respondent: [REDACTED]

Q2 N/A

Q3 I live in Hartest and have done so for 34 years; I run a small consultancy business.

Q4 I am commenting on the plan identified above.

Q5 I am commenting generally, however, where my comments have a more specific element, I have identified the part(s) of the plan to which they relate.

Q6 See below

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Chairman and the members of the Working Group for undertaking the enormous amount of work that this Plan represents. It is probably a colossal understatement to say that this has not been an easy task and I hope that you can all take pride in and satisfaction from having got to this stage, after contributing 4 years of hard, sustained effort.

I would like to make a couple of comments about the presentation of the Plan:

- i) There are places where the formatting seems to have taken leave of its senses and words have run together to create seamless blocks of text punctuated by full stops. For example, page 12, Section 2.6, page 13, Section 3.5, page 14, Sections 4.3 and 4.4.
- ii) Appendix 4, The Glossary, is very helpful, however I am sure readers would appreciate this preceding the substance of the Plan or at least its existence being mentioned before the Executive Summary begins. It would also be helpful, where acronyms for terms are used, to have these added to the relevant glossary explanations in bold. For example, **Built up Area Boundary (BUAB)**. The acronyms **AONB**, **NPPF** are used in the text but definitions are not included in the Glossary.

Re: Section 6 - 8 (primarily)

I find the Plan to make consummate sense with its emphasis on small developments of a few houses focused in the cluster areas identified. Over many years the village has grown 'organically' and in response to immediate local housing need (e.g. labourers' cottages adjacent to farms and in some cases, the availability of buildings for conversion to dwelling houses). This has been coupled with some infill building. This pattern needs to be replicated as far as possible in the future if the village is to retain its physical integrity, charm and uniqueness as well as its cohesiveness as a community.

In contrast to this, I understand from discussing the future of Hartest with other village residents, that there are some individuals who would advocate estate(s) of houses being built. It would appear that these proposals also involve the estate(s) being constructed on tracts of land other than in the location of the clusters, for instance close to the Built Up Area Boundary. This makes no sense whatsoever as considerations such as vehicular access, significant increase in the numbers of cars moving through the village, the resultant increased pollution, adverse impact on the natural habitats, strain on the already over-burdened sewage system, lack of amenities (no shop or post office, poor public transport, lack of mobile phone coverage and high speed broadband provision) seem to have been conveniently forgotten by this proposal..

It is clear that the Working Group has ensured that the Plan has been generated democratically and shaped by a consensus of the views and opinions of residents. As it goes forward through the Final Consultation stage and beyond, I believe that, without major adjustment, it will safeguard the village for the future and its chances of retaining "...the unique and special character of the built and natural environment..." The Plan has my full support.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 10 May 2017 at 10:05
To: [REDACTED]

R16

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)
Respondent skipped this question

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Proposals Map (if so please go straight to Question 6)

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- Proposals Map

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

We have serious concerns over housing proposals on Shimpling Road. The road is already extremely busy and we have a very sharp corner outside our property. The road is very narrow and already struggles with traffic and in many places it is not possible to pass without having to pull into a layby or private driveway. Increased traffic will make this increasingly difficult. The road also has major problems with drainage and last year we almost flooded which we assumed would be impossible being at the top of a hill! Another major concern whilst building was in progress would be the machinery, vehicles and deliveries and the bridge at the bottom of the hill is another contentious issue as although the weight restrictions have been lifted surely we still have to be conscious of more vehicles as well as heavier ones. Many of the houses around us are listed properties and we believe this would be a detriment to them and their surroundings. There are also no paths to and from the village making it less accessible for the amenities. Other residents who live in Shimpling Road have apparently also commented on the hill becoming suburbanised with recent building works and artificial lighting which is contradictory to the proposals at the Fosters proposal. On the proposals map it states that the area between us (Whistlers) and Fosters is a visually important gap, but is that stating the view is only important from the road, as from our house any building work done on the border with the field next to us will have a serious effect to not only our view but noise and lighting? When we submitted our original plans it was felt that our garage roof line was too high and therefore we had to have it redesigned lower which effected our roof space so surely this works both ways? Looking at the proposals map it does seem apparent that there are other areas that have wider roads, less traffic, fewer properties around and nearer to the amenities such as Somerton Road

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 9 May 2017 at 11:16
To: [REDACTED]

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

None

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 3 – Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 4 – Housing Mix

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

I believe that Policies HAR 3 and HAR 4 are of paramount importance in providing protection of the essential heritage of the village from multi-property style development by limiting the number of houses per site while allowing for future needs for affordable housing. Not one of us would enjoy having a large over- developed site on our doorstep ill befitting the village. I believe it absolutely right that the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan sets out to allow small but widely distributed future residential development outside the built-up area of the village, and that this will achieve the most empathetic results. I support and thank the NP Group for all their labours.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 27 May 2017 at 10:30
To: [REDACTED]

R18

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

n/a

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 3 – Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

Regarding the statement in HAR-3 "In addition, planning applications outside, but adjacent to, the Built-up Area Boundary should be accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment in accordance with Policy HAR 11." we feel that this should also be extended to include developments within the Clusters. Because of the higher elevation of the Clusters, the buildings in the clusters are visible from considerable distances away. For example, properties in the Old Mill Cluster can be seen from both Sommerton Hill and Chadacre.

From: [REDACTED]
 Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
 Date: 27 May 2017 at 10:30
 To: [REDACTED]

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

Resident

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 1 – Hartest's Settlement Pattern Policy
- HAR 2 – Housing Development within the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 3 – Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 4 – Housing Mix
- HAR 5 - Replacement dwellings
- Neighbourhood Plan Text (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- HAR 6 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

I live in Hartest and have done so all of my life with exception to two brief spells in Long Melford and Great Cornard owing to housing not being available. I keep horses in Boxted and have done so both in Boxted and Hartest over the last 25 years.

I feel that the whilst the Draft Neighbourhood Plan Sets out a good direction and intent for the future. It seems somewhat unrealistic given current development trends, opportunities and planning applications for the area. (eg Section 1.4...Sustainable mixed thriving community... Section 4.5 Economic Role, Social Role... Section 5, 5.1 Thriving and inclusive community....Sufficient homes jobs, services, facilities and infrastructure to enable local people to live and meet their day to day needs in the local area...)

Section 6, Hartest's Spatial Strategy sets out the Planning Policy Core Strategy of which CS11 iv) Locally identified housing need... The Neighbourhood plan identifies in this section the need for small low cost or affordable housing especially for young people. This is a category that I fall into which is not currently available nor in the current planning applications and direction seems achievable. I am in full time employment and would relish the opportunity to buy a house within this market value and size however opportunities are limited and it appears in section 7 will continue to be limited. I currently rent privately and see my future in Hartest.

Section 6 cont. CS11 criteria suggests well designed and appropriate in size/scale... Current proposals do not identify with this nor the need for small families, downsizing and balancing the market enabling residents to live comfortably to their needs in their community. Section 6. Cont. Policy Har1- Discusses small scale in nature developments, contribute towards meeting local needs and are related to the existing pattern.... The local needs identify smaller houses for young people and downsizing of older residents yet in section 7 only 50% of that typical size are targeted (3 bedroom or below, approx 15% 2 bedroom)

Section 7, 7.9, Housing needs Survey - I fall into the category of the five people seeking 2 bed or below. I currently private rent a two bedroom property.

Section 7.22 - I would like to clarify that my argument for housing which typically falls under the 'affordable' housing banner in terms of size would be as a private sale or acquisition to me on the basis that the current 4 bedroom and above are not economically viable in my situation. I would support housing of this scale such as semi-detached/mews conversions etc so long as a high standard of design and consideration for context (historically sensitive/conservation area is considered)

7.23 It is clear that there is a need for housing of a suitable scale and development size/cluster which will ensure the village demographic is balanced, numbers continue for school, doctors surgery, pub and other such services. These numbers should hopefully contribute to safeguarding for all.

Case studies of similar situations both context and scale should be a driver for this with high quality design being key for low density requirements within or near to the conservation area. For example sensitive conversion of existing farm grade or historic buildings into more than one unit could be see achievable quotas delivered without drastic increase of building massing or visual intrusion.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey [REDACTED]
Date: 8 May 2017 at 15:32
To: [REDACTED]

R20/R21

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

N/a

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 10: Development proposals in the Special Landscape Area
- HAR 11 – Protection of important views
- HAR 16 - Economic Development
- HAR 17 – Provision and retention of services and facilities

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

Har 16 We feel it is important for Hartest to be a sustainable village. Opportunities for economic growth should be considered at all times as a priority, particularly when a local interest is expressed. Har 11 Whilst acknowledging that environmental and conservation issues are important (e.g. views), we do not feel this should preclude innovation and change. Har 17 Since the original report came out, the school has moved forward considerably, with the anticipated appointment of a new, enthusiastic head teacher, who, in a temporary capacity has already increased numbers on role and formed strong links with stakeholders. Proposals to make available both the school swimming pool and play area for our local community are already underway. We support this move and would encourage the Parish Council to put any available funds towards those ends. General Comments We appreciate the huge amount of work put in by the Neighbourhod Plan team, in particular the leadership. Housing in general: whilst principles can be useful, we feel too many restrictions can ultimately inhibit growth of both business opportunities and population growth in Hartest. Not all situations can be anticipated; therefore all new ideas and applications should be considered on their own individual merits and in relation to the applicant's unique situation.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 27 May 2017 at 10:31
To: [REDACTED]

R22/R23

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)
Respondent skipped this question

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- General Comments

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

Firstly we want to say how impressed we are with the thoroughness and scrupulous attention to detail of the Neighbourhood Plan. Those who have worked on it are to be congratulated on the depth and scope of the Plan and also the excellent way in which it is written making it very readable and accessible. We can imagine that no Neighbourhood Plan will ever please everyone in a village but although we may not agree with every little thing, we wholeheartedly endorse the recommendations provided in the Plan. In particular, we feel that the issue of housing has been very sensitively addressed. In general this is clearly a Plan for the future potential growth of Hartest while ensuring the built and natural environment are in keeping with the visual and 'emotional' feel of the village. We think you have done a superb, thoughtful and professional job.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Survey Monkey
Date: 8 May 2017 at 13:18
To: [REDACTED]

Q1: Your Full Name

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

Respondent skipped this question

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- General Comments

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

I have read the plan with great interest, but most interesting to me, and others, is the fact that at least three of the members of the working group have a development background. Have any of the planning group had to declare an interest, in respect that they might at some future time want to submit a planning application of their own, on land identified by them as development land in this plan? this of course would cast a shadow of suspicion over their motives for joining the group in the first place. I hope this is not the case. Would such a scenario lead to a legal challenge? and if so, who would be held accountable, the Parish plan group, or the Parish council?

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey [REDACTED]
Date: 8 May 2017 at 15:31
To: [REDACTED]

R25

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

Respondent skipped this question

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan
- Proposals Map (if so please go straight to Question 6)
- Character Assessment (if so please go straight to Question 6)

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 1 – Hartest's Settlement Pattern Policy
- HAR 2 – Housing Development within the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 3 – Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 4 – Housing Mix
- HAR 5 - Replacement dwellings
- HAR 6 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites
- HAR 7 – Biodiversity Assets
- HAR 8 – Protecting and maintaining features of biodiversity value
- HAR 9 - Special Landscape Area
- HAR 10: Development proposals in the Special Landscape Area
- HAR 11 – Protection of important views
- HAR 12 - Settlement Gaps
- HAR 13 - Local Green Space
- HAR 14 – Protection of Heritage Assets
- HAR 15 – Design Principles
- HAR 16 - Economic Development
- HAR 17 – Provision and retention of services and facilities
- HAR 18 - Crown Public House
- Community Actions (please state the community action number you are commenting in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- Proposals Map
- The Character Assessment (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- Neighbourhood Plan Text (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- General Comments

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

Thank you to everyone who has played a part in the collection and correlation of information contained in this document. It makes very interesting reading and has heightened my awareness of this environment that I am privileged to call my home. Understandably, I have serious concerns for this unique village and it's survival for posterity and feel my share of responsibility as one custodian. I have a particular concern for The Green and its trees and would like to support any plans to care for trees in the present and in planning for it's future. Thank you, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stop The Press!
Date: 5 May 2017 at 11:00
To: [REDACTED]

R26

TL

The first response has come in on the Survey Monkey and its resoundingly positive.

Q1: Your Full Name

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)
Respondent skipped this question
Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan
- Proposals Map (if so please go straight to Question 6)
- Character Assessment (if so please go straight to Question 6)

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- HAR 1 – Hartest's Settlement Pattern Policy
- HAR 2 – Housing Development within the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 3 – Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary
- HAR 4 – Housing Mix
- HAR 5 - Replacement dwellings
- HAR 7 – Biodiversity Assets
- HAR 8 – Protecting and maintaining features of biodiversity value
- HAR 9 - Special Landscape Area
- HAR 10: Development proposals in the Special Landscape Area
- HAR 11 – Protection of important views
- HAR 13 - Local Green Space
- HAR 14 – Protection of Heritage Assets
- HAR 15 – Design Principles
- HAR 16 - Economic Development
- HAR 17 – Provision and retention of services and facilities
- The Character Assessment (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- Neighbourhood Plan Text (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

All aspects of the Neighbourhood plan are excellent , thoroughly researched and well presented The committee should be congratulated on their work

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 9 May 2017 at 11:15
To: [REDACTED]

R27

TL

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

Respondent skipped this question

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Proposals Map (if so please go straight to Question 6)
- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- Neighbourhood Plan Text (please quote the paragraph you are commenting on in the comments form at the beginning of your response)
- HAR 11 – Protection of important views
- HAR 1 – Hartest's Settlement Pattern Policy

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

Policy HAR 11 has been informed by the expressed wish of local people to place the protection of the special landscape around the village at the heart of the Neighbourhood Plan Distinctive views from public vantage points either within or into the built-up areas and clusters, or out of built-up areas or clusters to the surrounding countryside shall be maintained. Development proposals within the Hartest Built-Up Area Boundary, as defined on the Policies Map, will be permitted provided they accord with the other provisions of the adopted Development Plan. - There is a level of ambiguity here which could be addressed In particular; 'Visually Important Gaps' are quite specific 'Defined Clusters' are not. In some cases, Visually Important Gaps run through Defined Clusters. This would not seem to be in keeping with policy HAR11. Could the plan be more specific when defining areas? Currently, they look fairly vague. Defining more clearly would allow you to lay them around Visually Important Gaps now. It would provide confidence to the local community and prevent confusion or ambiguity in the future.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Neighbourhood Plan - Comment
Date: 17 May 2017 at 15:16
To: [REDACTED]

Nick,

Firstly I would like to congratulate you and you team for all your hard work producing a comprehensive and detailed plan although I must admit that for the uninitiated it is quite heavy going. But that will probably always be the case in order for it to meet the needs of all interested parties.

I would particularly like to offer my support to the proposals for additional housing needs and would wholly concur with the suggestion that any developments should be wherever possible within the detailed clusters and then limited to three or four dwellings in order to maintain the architectural mix which currently benefits the general appearance of the village. The importance of maintaining the various unspoilt views cannot be underestimated for the benefit of all existing and intended residents. Any large scale or estate type development would only have a detrimental effect, overwhelm the infrastructure and could substantially change the nature and charm of the village we currently love.

Once again, thanks for all your efforts.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: NP Survey - [REDACTED]
Date: 27 May 2017 at 10:27
To: [REDACTED]

Q1: Your Full Name

[REDACTED]

Q2: Organisation Represented (where relevant)

home owner

Q3: Do you live, work or run a business in Hartest?

- Yes

Q4: Which document are you commenting on?

- Character Assessment (if so please go straight to Question 6)
- Proposals Map (if so please go straight to Question 6)
- Neighbourhood Plan

Q5: Which Paragraph Number, Policy Number or Community Action are you commenting on?

- General Comments

Q6: Please Enter Your Comments Below. Note you may resize this comment form to enter as long an answer as you require. Should you prefer you may email your comments direct to [REDACTED]

We are the owners of Fosters Farm and its related land on Hartest Hill. As a family we have owned the house since 1977; this is our second home. I am also an architect. I have read the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, studied the Proposals map and reviewed the Character Assessment. I think all three of these documents are well produced, well written and commendable. Also the graphics and layout of the Plan itself are unusually clear and legible, which is particularly welcome given the complexity of this piece of work. I would like to generally give my support to the proposals shown in these documents. Perhaps notably, I also support the Foster's Cluster proposal (along with the principals of the other clusters), as I think this makes welcome sense in terms of land planning to strengthen these historic settlement clusters, whilst protecting and clearly and vitally defining the agricultural land between. [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: 23 March 2017 at 21:34
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Price

Just like to let you know that I am very impressed by the draft Neighbourhood plan you and your groupmembers made. There are quite a few reasons why I, a Dutch person, choose Hartest as my second home and after having read the professional plan I appreciate being in the undulating ancient farmland even more. I do help increasing tourism a bit though, as my Dutch friends stay or rent my place during the holidays.

Success with the plan and the execution thereof

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Meeting Thursday 30 March
Date: 30 March 2017 at 18:33
To: [REDACTED]

LO3

DL

Dear Nick,

I am afraid that my hip problem has become quite incapacitating and apologise for not being able to come to the meeting this evening. I had particularly wanted to attend as I am unclear about how the group has moved from its early position of wanting to deny the presumptive favour of CS11 for development adjacent to the BUAB and seek policies that would enable dispersed proposals that had no negative impacts on the landscape and views.

The draft plan does not seem to restrict CS11 and has introduced new lines on the map around the proposed clusters.

Whilst an understanding of the settlement history of the village should refer to clusters they would not be as represented now.

There was a cluster at the southern end of the row which is now attached by ribbon development. There was a cluster at Fosters and another at Elizals. Cross Green would not have included Trenton or the Hatch or the Warrens or the row of 8 houses built up the Brockley Road. Pear Tree farm and the bungalow are the result of agricultural exemption from planning constraints as was Springfield - there is no historic justification for this proposed cluster. By historic I mean 100 years or more.

So, sorry to go on, but I am interested to know how the group got moved from its focus on views to drawing contentious lines on the map.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation
Date: 8 March 2017 at 15:23
To: [REDACTED]

LO4

MW

[REDACTED]

Below comments made regarding the local plan and submitted into the survey.

Regards, Mark.

Mark Westwood,
Mark Westwood Ltd,
Chapel Farm Office,
Ringshall, Stowmarket,
Suffolk IP14 2JA
01473 658 378 (w)
01473 658 008 (f)
07860 800 650 (m)

Community action 10 is for improvement in the provision of mobile phone signals and higher and faster high speed broadband.

Boxted Estate in 2015 made a site proposal for a mobile phone mast, to serve both Hartest and Boxted, which was under the then Government Scheme to improve mobile phone signal coverage within the region. The site was approved by the District Council.
The site was on the hill behind the school at Hartest and was rejected by Hartest Council. The site was outside of the currently proposed purple dotted conservation area as outlined on the proposals map.
Boxted Estate will continue to have the site available, or any other suggestions, should Hartest Village really want to have improved signals. However, the fact that they previously rejected one site will mean that any lobbying they plan to do, will be extremely difficult to justify based on their reluctance to accept a site less than 2 years ago.
The Boxted Estate will help wherever possible to secure better mobile signal coverage.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 March 2017 09:11
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: mark.westwood@agri.co.uk
Subject: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation

Dear [REDACTED]

As a landowner within Hartest Parish, the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Working Group would like to draw your attention to the Pre-Submission Consultation of the draft Hartest Neighbourhood Plan.

The consultation period will run for 6 weeks ending on 17 April 2017. The plan, and its associated documents, are available to view at the Hartest Parish Council website, along with