

Respondents' Comments on Local Plan Survey March 2016

These comments should not be taken out of context but should be read in conjunction with the overall survey results.

3a	CASH 167 Land rear of 118-132 Nunnery Street, Castle Hedingham
	<p>FOR: Easily accessible infill site for small development with not too much impact on the village</p> <p>AGAINST: This has in the past been refused planning from the highest level. Entrance to site unsuitable and most of the site is outside village envelope. Disagree as on a flood plain. It is flood plain and has poor access from Nunnery Street. Access if to the East side is currently very narrow, and access if to the West side would cause further congestion/incidents over the narrow bridge. There have been seen several "near misses" here. Light pollution will affect all properties 118 – 132 many of which are listed buildings. There are also 2 protected trees on the site. Lots of wildlife in this area would be affected.</p>
3b	CASH 168 Land adjacent to Sudbury Road, opposite Coppingdown Farm, Castle Hedingham
	<p>FOR: Easily accessible infill site for small development with not too much impact on the village</p> <p>AGAINST: We should not set a precedent building on farm land. There is no safe walking route into the village</p>
3c	CASH 169 Land to rear of dwellings fronting Nunnery Street, Castle Hedingham
	<p>FOR: Easily accessible infill site for small development with not too much impact on the village</p> <p>AGAINST: Disagree – Flood plain, Do you really want to build on a known trouble spot?. This would sever the meadow and would contribute to the decline of our green spaces and tranquil footpaths which our family use every week. Where would be the access point for this?</p>
3d	CASH 170 Land adjacent to De Vere Primary School, Kirby Hall Rd, Castle Hedingham
	<p>FOR: <i>(But not necessarily housing development)</i>: Ideal site for car park to accommodate school traffic, possibility for a new play area if we are to lose area 553. Also good area for development i.e. housing. Surely it would make more sense to provide extra parking for De Vere Primary and pre-school. Hope the primary school might be increased in size some day. It would benefit the community to keep a playing area, my suggestion would be to have it here next to the school, maybe a car park for the school too. Agree- this is on sterile arable land Possible site for consideration of the need for low-cost affordable housing. Agree as long as car parking is made available for extra school places and school safety considered Disagree unless it is for expansion of the school Agree for expansion of the school, disagree for housing. Better to use this for the school. Using this land for school extension would be OK I would agree with this development provided it does not extend to the whole field. If this happens the area would be spoilt and the road infrastructure would not be able to cope. If there are going to be more school places, hence the expansion of the school, it would be sensible for the school to acquire more land in Kirby Hall Road. Parking has always been an issue for residents and more houses would make the situation worse.</p> <p>AGAINST: We should not set a precedent building on farm land Could make more danger for school children Strongly Disagree - have massive issues with access, dangerous parking and safety along Kirby Hall Road. My 2 year old was knocked down by a car. NO MORE CARS PLEASE! Development of the Kirby Hall Road site to encompass parking for the school is the obvious answer. Land next to the school should not be used for housing, it might be needed to expand school facilities Development would increase traffic problems and also cause problems for farm vehicles. Most definitely no additional housing on Kirby Hall Road. Access is already bad enough. Paving over this land would cause flooding in Kirby Hall Road area as already happens when field is ploughed. Already congested next to school, discourage strip development What about traffic provision – it's bad enough at school hours Traffic increase caused by development next to a school can only lead to child injury. Definitely not – this land may be needed for development of larger primary school.</p>

3e CASH 505 Colne Valley Railway, Yeldham Road, Castle Hedingham

FOR: Agree providing it does not impinge on Colne Valley Railway. Only agree with development if the future of CVR is secure.

AGAINST: This is on a flood plain, is it sensible to build here?

Flood plain – in very heavy rain and water surges this could endanger more houses for flooding. This is a flood plain – do you really want to build on a known trouble spot? FLOOD!

Wildlife consideration- otters, fish etc.

Concerned this will eventually merge Castle Hedingham with Yeldham. Ribbon development along the Yeldham Road, concern that Castle Hedingham would join Great Yeldham. If this is allowed then over time Castle Hedingham and Great Yeldham will merge into one with further housing infill. Development here smacks of urban sprawl and would destroy the distinct natures of Castle and Yeldham.

This is just too large and the link between this and site CASH169 is unclear

Far too large, would have devastating impact on the village

Strongly disagree - Unrelated to any conurbation and is on the flood plain

Strongly disagree – CVR local attraction draws visitors spending money in area and is low lying land.

Strongly disagree – this village needs tourist sites to support local businesses.

Disagree - no safe walking route to Hedingham School and village etc.

3f CASH 553 Land at Sudbury Hill/St James Street Castle Hedingham

FOR: Agree as long as suitable playground with good equipment is supplied – maybe near Memorial Hall (toilet there already) seems suitable and safe. Children’s play area needs to be moved next door to Memorial Hall, land currently used is badly placed for access off a busy road. If the play amenities were removed to the Memorial Hall it would be better. Agree – conditional upon dedication of amenity land to the village.

AGAINST: Historical site and should not be developed – site of St James Well and best suited as a playing field. This is an old sacred site and should be left as a playing field. Should not be developed as is in Conservation Area. There are barely any green areas in Castle Hedingham, we certainly do not need development on the few there are. Conservation area so should NOT be built on!! This is supposed to be a protected area and as such should not be open for debate.

We should not build on childrens’ play area. Should not be developed as it is in the Conservation area

Conservation area - as a play area this is in a safe part of the village and must remain intact.

Important that the playing field remains and is improved for the recreation of the young of the village

Playing field best left as it is, best place for children to play and has pavements for safe access.

Playing field more suitable as it is now as access with no pavements not suitable for children.

Existing playing field should remain, the site adjacent to the Memorial Hal is not a suitable site for play equipment

There is no justification for building on green open space in the village.

Childrens swings etc. need to be somewhere in the village.

The old allotments should remain as a green area in the centre of the village. We would not support CASH 553 if there was a “quid pro quo” for development on the old allotments site.

I live opposite and have no houses in front of me – I want it to stay that way.

This is the only open space within the village and should remain as such. The parish should invest in the park if no building takes place. A village of this size should have one open space for young and older children to play.

The park?

I strongly disagree to any developments whatsoever to CASH 553

The land at CASH 553 would be much better as a park and/or nature reserve. Will happily plant trees there for free and even supply trees for free if necessary. Sure there are other villagers who will be prepared to do the same. Even farmers’ fields are not real countryside and support very little wildlife. We need more natural spaces. Essential for village character, ambience, enjoyment and leisure. Of the whole village it is one of only two unbuilt spaces and both are well used. Amphibians are frequent at New Park and the pond adjacent should not be enveloped by built development, rather the SW part of the site should be managed as a wildlife-friendly habitat linked to the hedging etc. Heritage value e.g. old meeting place and well should be information boarded, not built on.

Feel very strongly that a green/play area should be kept here. If we want healthy people we must keep space for recreation and exercise. The village should not “shift an inch” on this issue.

Cannot comment until the playing field situation is sorted out.

Are there any comments you would like to make on the above or other related issues?

General:

Too much building already i.e. Sible Hedingham is changing the character of the area for the worse. Development on former Rippers site will create a large influx of people who will use services in both Castle & Sible. Already got a huge development on the doorstep at the old Premdor site. There has been enough development in the Hedinghams, we have a huge new estate on Rippers. More development would change the character of the village. There is already a large housing development in Sible Hedingham built on a disused factory site and Castle Hedingham should not have its parish spoilt with any new development- it is overcrowded enough!

The setting of a relatively unspoiled important historic market town should remain unspoiled. Castle Hedingham is a village and should be allowed by BDC to remain so. I was born and bred in this village and have seen the village being gradually spoilt over the years– for goodness sake keep some open spaces in the village and not put it all down to concrete and tarmac. It is proven that green spaces are important for peoples' mental well-being. Constant building and the removal of open land will be to the detriment of small villages like Castle Hedingham. There has already been substantial development in Sible Hedingham and that should easily satisfy the local needs for housing.

I strongly disagree with any future housing in and around our lovely village. It is important that the principles of the Village Design Statement are upheld. This is a historic village the nature of which will be changed irrevocably if the building projects take place. Let us protect the heritage of Castle Hedingham. I was born in the village as was my mother and have lived here most of my life. I have seen many changes, but enough is enough.

Green spaces should be kept as green spaces/play areas. Any development will increase the march onwards of the decline of village life. I have lived here only 8 years but have seen so much change not for the best. If people want to live in a town let them choose to do so, don't build one here. To all concerned – when you have destroyed this village and countryside together with the UK way of life, will you then be satisfied?

Castle Hedingham is a rural village and it's our wish it remain so. If housing is allowed in CASH 167 168, 169, 170 or 505 it will set a precedent so that further development along the adjacent roads cannot be prevented. Plenty of room on Rosemary Lane and Kirby Hall Road with less likelihood of flooding.

There are very few villages that still have the charm of Castle Hedingham and because of the history here I feel that it should remain the same.

I have thoroughly enjoyed walking the many footpaths in and around the village and am sure many people still do, which is why I disagree with more land to be given to building. Very selfish I am sure, I will not be alive in 2033. We live in a lovely village with a fantastic community spirit. Any developments that put this at risk should be strongly opposed. I have lived in a village that was ruined by allowing additional housing over the years so that the village became one with no spirit and not defined boundary. All community spirit was lost and we moved!! We believe any plot that is agreed will merely set a precedent for any future proposed plans next to current proposals and as such cannot agree with any such development. This is a village that needs protecting as many others have been swallowed up with urban sprawl.

We need to protect our small villages to avoid them becoming ruined and turned into towns. Inappropriate new build housing would damage the character of the village. High density housing would also be unwelcome.

It is clear that the UK needs more housing and we all need to take a balanced view about where this takes place. My preference would be for no further development in Castle Hedingham. Realistically, however, more housing will be forced upon us and so I have tried to indicate those areas which I believe would be least impactful on our beautiful village. Most importantly, when development is permitted building styles should be in keeping with their surroundings and not just making maximum profit for builders.

It is important that Castle Hedingham plays its part in providing more homes. I think we should stick together and try to keep the "green areas" that we have, namely the old allotment site and the recreation field.

Village envelope:

Developments on the outskirts of the village would be more suitable so the village would be unspoilt. This is the thin end of the wedge in that once the village envelope is expanded it could be expanded again and again. Areas for development should be limited to those within the village envelope or beside existing housing and just outside the existing envelope.

Building outside village envelope: Bad re: visibility of traffic, bad re: ribbon building contributing to urban sprawl, bad re: flood plain.

The centre of the village is already over developed with no room for car parking. Any development outside the village envelope will create a precedent for further development and the eventual urbanisation of Castle and Sible Hedingham. I feel very strongly that Castle Hedingham village boundary should

remain unchanged and that additional housing is not allowed.
If more houses are built we would soon merge with Sible Hedingham and become one parish.
We strongly agree the Village Envelope should remain unchanged.

Affordable homes/Starter homes:

Some support for a very small development of starter housing.
We need more affordable housing for people with young families or who would like to settle here.
We need more affordable housing for young people
While we appreciate the need for more housing we feel it should be for starter homes. With the parking problem which exists, each property must have sufficient parking.
Are these houses going to be Housing Association or private or both?
50% of new housing should be social housing for council letting and NOT for selling.
Any housing that is proposed should be social housing i.e. affordable and not just affordable once. It should be there for the local community in an area that is becoming out of reach for many that live here.
All future building must provide suitable "off road" parking for 3 cars per dwelling. Development must supply properties for first time buyers and young families.

Flood plain:

There should be no development on the flood plain. Disagree with development on flood plains.
We should never build on flood plains, it increases the cost of house insurance for everyone.
If you build on the flood plain house purchasers would not get flood cover and would not be included in the new Flood Re scheme so think this is a very silly suggestion.
No housing should be built on or next to flood zones. There are already significant flooding issues in Castle Hedingham. This is also general good sense.

Infrastructure:

Infrastructure and access to the village does not support additional housing. Any additional housing would compromise the infrastructure of the village.
Demands on roads, schools, medical facilities need to be factored in taking into account other developments locally
Infrastructure to accommodate more families including parking. Also adequate drainage to make sure no flooding.
The Premdor site in Sible Hedingham is huge and will overwhelm our schools, doctors, roads etc. so against anything but very small development. Infrastructure can't support any more houses, difficult to get through Sible Hedingham now. The Premdor site which is now built on will bring more people to the area without providing any jobs. Schools will not cope with many more either.
It is absolutely ridiculous to keep building homes on patches of land while doing nothing to improve the supporting infrastructure. It is already a nightmare trying to get through Sible and Gosfield and the A120 due to increased traffic. Unless a by-pass is built around the village, more vehicular access will cause more problems with parking & visibility
Each new dwelling is likely to result in at least two more vehicles for the occupiers which will add to an already severe congestion problem in the centre of the village where off-street parking is not available.
Traffic in Sible Hedingham needs addressing before any further major developments are approved. Castle Hedingham also has traffic concerns especially with large buses and HGVs.
Increased traffic through the village will cause wear and tear on period properties close to the road.
There is enough traffic coming through Castle Hedingham at present, especially Sudbury Hill & St James St.
No more traffic needed, roads cannot cope
We have concerns regarding Nunnery Street which is already a "rat run". Planned infrastructure must be put in place to make sure the road does not become even busier.
Increase in traffic on small country roads.
Is it possible to slow down the traffic up Nunnery Street and Bayley Street? So many parked cars the visibility is limited.
Castle Hedingham is already busy especially during the summer, parking & travel through the village and into Sible Hedingham is also bad.
I live on Nunnery Street and in the mornings and rush hours it is already manic. Drivers do not respect others especially at the bridge. All these developments will make it worse.
The road out of the village towards Sible is very narrow especially by the Wheatsheaf, any more traffic on this road will surely cause a serious accident.
Has anybody thought about car parking for all these new houses? Our village needs suitable parking in all existing areas.

Logistics not adequate, e.g. doctors, primary school, shops and parking.
I would like the school to be expanded or updated if there were more housing. Need to ensure adequate school provision: De Vere already seems over stretched.
Concerns of increasing: Traffic, Crime, School places
The roads, doctors and schools are under pressure now without extra people and traffic coming here.
The village infrastructure is already under stress and further large development can only make matters worse unless improvements are made
The village infrastructure cannot sustain the additional loading on sewage, drainage, electricity supply and

communications without major upgrade.

It is almost impossible to get a doctor's appointment and local public transport is almost non-existent.

The sewage works stinks a lot of summer, it can barely cope with existing properties. Water supplies along Nunnery Street regularly leak, eroding the road. Internet speeds are poor for a lot of the village, so I think the infrastructure needs improving.

Sewers!!! Power supply improvements, roads and provision for additional traffic etc. Already strain on village sewers, facilities, school, doctors – where will it stop?

We feel the infrastructure is not in place to cope with more housing, nor the roads and parking for yet more cars. I cannot agree with housing in or close to the village due to ancient drainage and water pipes which are already having difficulty coping with our needs.

The infrastructure in the village cannot support the number of houses proposed, especially medical/roads.

Can the infrastructure of Sible & Castle take more development i.e. doctors, schools, roads. I chose to live in "a village", surely there are much more viable areas than here!!

Village infrastructure cannot support any more housing.

There are insufficient facilities for a larger population and no jobs.

Would spoil the village if too many houses were built. The odd one or two are OK but any more makes too much traffic and problems re doctors, schools etc.

We believe there is sufficient housing already throughout the village and we do not want the character of the village to be changed or to see an increase in cars throughout the immediate area.

We are still awaiting the "Health Centre"! Infrastructure is vital to further development.

The infrastructure of the village couldn't support more housing, also we wouldn't like to lose the feeling of a proper village. There is already too much traffic and pollution on our small village roads and the infrastructure would not cope.

There is neither the infrastructure, nor parking, to cope with any large increase in the population.

Primary school cannot expand enough to take in large development as well as Rippers site housing.

Any significant increase in the village will put pressure on roads and infrastructure.

What arrangements are being considered for additional facilities i.e. schooling, medical, bus service, car parking etc.