

2R1

HH

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Latest Hartest NP docs
Date: 22 March 2018 at 13:00
To: nickhmprice@btinternet.com

[REDACTED]

Thankyou for the information at the meeting last night. Well done for persevering with this against all odds.
We are happy to endorse all the latest documents

When first announced SALC representative said anything the residents wanted in a NP would have to be accepted by Babergh. The goalposts have and continue to be moved and it seems ironic that the platform for moving forward with the plan rests on the Paddocks development which was opposed by the NP committee, PC, Babergh planning officer and many residents.

Is there a danger that once the present docs are lodged with Babergh other developments such as this can take place before the final referendum and acceptance of the NP at the end of 2019 ?

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]
sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
 Subject: Hartest Neighbourhood Plan
 Date: 23 April 2018 at 10:21
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Price

I refer to the Revised HNP which was provided for further public consultation earlier this year.

The revised plan and the opportunity to have further comment, is appreciated, as are the amendments to the plan which have been adopted as a result of the first phase of consultation..

The following comments are offered for the consideration of the HNP Group. The first two issues (Clusters and Replacement Dwellings) are the key substantive issues, while the others are observations.

SECTION 7 - HOUSING (Clusters 7.17-7.19)

The **restriction on floor area** for new dwellings is recognised and supported.

The wording of this section appears only to relate to "undeveloped plots". Please see **comments on "Replacement Dwellings", below**. Are any words of clarification beneficial in this section about "replacement dwellings", if only to refer to HAR6?

For the purposes of record, we remain unconvinced by the "Cluster" concept adopted by the HNP and consider that it conflicts with national policies including the NPPF, Paragraph 55, which provides support for the Core Strategy hierarchy of settlements. However, we recognise that National Policies change and this concept will not be abandoned in the HNP. Thus, the implications will have to be determined in future planning discussions on an "as needed" basis.

REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS:

HAR6 states "replacement dwellings in the countryside". For the avoidance of doubt, **can the words "in the countryside" be deleted?** (ie: HAR6 applies to all replacement dwellings).

If this is NOT the case, the situation;

- in and adjacent to the BUAB, and
- in "clusters"

would benefit from clarification.

We would assume that there would be a better case for a higher density of "replacement housing" in a plot in the BUAB (better reflects the high housing density already existing there) than in a Cluster or "the countryside".

However, in accordance with adopted local policy, it is my understanding that replacement dwellings must be of similar size to existing and there must be no increase in the number of dwellings on the site. Similarly, it my understanding that draft Development Management policies on this subject requires replacement dwellings to be 'one for one'. **Would HAR6 (omitting the words "in the countryside") would be appropriate for adoption in the HNP?**

Please could there be **explicit advise** about the HNP policy for replacement dwellings inside "clusters" prior to the plan being finalised.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON RURAL EXCEPTION SITES:

HAR 7 addresses affordable housing on rural exception sites. It should be stated that this is not a topic upon which I am well versed. Does HAR 6 comply with CS20 (relationship to a settlement boundary)? In accordance with the text of section 7.28 (page 38) of the HNP, perhaps the Policy should firstly and predominantly address affordable housing "appropriately located close to the heart of the village" and therefore adjacent to the BUAB. Could HAR 6 specify that **Rural Exception Sites will be prioritised and encouraged where they are adjacent to or well-related to the BUAB?**

DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO BUAB

It is appreciated that the **revised** HNP recognises and encourages the potential for development adjacent to the BUAB, which will benefit from the proximity of services and facilities. **Provision of such developments will also benefit from suitable paths for the safety and convenience of residents and particularly children attending the local school.**

HOUSING MIX

HAR5: Is there any benefit (all things being equal) for encouraging developers to propose **bungalows** within new developments to provide better accommodation for elderly and infirm?

ERRATUM

Please be advised that the last paragraph on page should be amended from 6.8 to 6.9 (page 23)

Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to the draft HNP. My apologies if some of the intricacies of planning policy may or may not be properly represented in my comments. It is a subject too byzantine for me to have a good working knowledge.

It is clear that adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan will greatly benefit Hartest and its inhabitants. The efforts of the Planning Group and the HPC is therefore appreciated and acknowledged. I wish you success in progressing the plan through adoption.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Nick

It was good to see so many people attending the Neighbourhood Plan meeting. I think many valid points were raised although I felt it was a little like Question Time with not many straight answers being given.

The points I raised in my previous emails remain, but I would like to add a couple of additional.

It was mentioned that a 'cluster' typically comprises of 10 dwellings or more. The Old Mill cluster contains 8 dwellings, and the Fosters cluster contains 5 dwellings. At the meeting you mentioned joining these two clusters to form one cluster of 13 dwellings.

If this is the case, it causes some additional issues.

Your cluster policy states that development could take place within (infil) in the clusters, but not on the edge. Does that then mean that planning permission could be granted between Elizels Cottage and Top of the Hill, and likewise on the other side of the road between Whistlers and Fosters as these spaces would then become cluster 'infil'? If so, this is contradictory to your Policy HAR12 (Important Gaps) which in itself already conflicts with the 2006 Babergh Local Plan Policy CNO3. Would this not also constitute 'ribbon development' which the Neighbourhood Plan are adamant they want to avoid? On this basis the Old Mill and Fosters clusters must remain as two individual clusters.

Could you clarify the Neighbourhood Plans position on this please and confirm how the final decision is made?

At the meeting it was also intimated (on more than one occasion) that nobody was behind or wanted the development that has been granted at The Paddocks on Lawshall Road. I personally believe that this is an excellent location for development - good access to all village amenities, minimal impact on important views and appropriate development for our village.

Look forward to hearing from you

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Price

Further to the recent meeting at The Institute, re-launching NP consultation I offer this feedback – as briefly as possible, although I could expand on them almost indefinitely..... These points were reflected in some of the comments made at the meeting and would support the wider vision of the Plan for the benefit of the village.

Objective 3 – include

Encourage legacy or gift provision of suitable plots of land for development of affordable housing, especially for rent.

Context: existing wealthy and ageing population, which would / will itself benefit from locally resident care workers who are unlikely otherwise to be able to afford market values in the village. 'Nomination rights' for rental of the new properties could be determined by the local GP practice with a view to helping accommodate key health or care workers who *could* then be within walking distance of their clients.

(Example of such land donation: Wills Green, Feering – 5 or 6 properties. Provided by local Crayston farming family, with properties built by a housing association and nomination rights determined by local council.)

Such donations could be part of a legacy arrangement – eg part of garden, without giving it all away.

Objective 5 – addition

'Improve the village' plus, while developing means to discourage through access by inappropriate regional freight and commuter vehicles.

Context: if access is improved, it's not just local traffic that will take advantage, yet it is the weight and speed of traffic just passing through which is degrading the locality. If all the villages along the 1066 could be just a little more of a hindrance to traffic, the combined effect would be to discourage route planners from using it as a rat run when the A143 and A134 should be the preferred choice. Many villages on this type of route in France have adopted quite effective traffic calming, (even hedges down the middle of the road) whereas by contrast in Holland 'shared spaces' which deprive motorists of the assumption of priority (distinctive paving, removal of street signs, shared pedestrian, cycle and vehicle space) have a radical effect on motorist behaviour. Unfortunately in the UK, we have permitted motorists to assume that nothing else much matters.

(While there is an uncomfortably obvious route for a by-pass for the village, it would just encourage more motorists and would in any case be unlikely to attract much support.... or funding)

Hope this helps and thanks for the opportunity.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10