



Rural Vision 2031

Preferred options document March 2012 response form

[Vision 2031](#)

In what format did this form arrive?

email

letter/paper questionnaire

A.

Contact details

Your name*

Claire Ebeling

Job title (if applicable)

Clerk to Clare Parish Council

Organisation/company

Clare Parish Council

Address*

The Old School
Callis Street
Clare
Suffolk

Postcode*

CO10 8PX

Telephone*

(01787) 277559

Email*

parishclerk@clare-uk.com

B.

Agents - Please complete details of the client/company you represent:-

Name

Organisation/company

Address

Postcode
Telephone
Email



Please complete as many of the questions as you can.

Question 1: Prince's Foundation vision statements (see page 17)

a) Do you agree with the vision statements from the work the Prince's Foundation?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) What would you change?
please give details.

Selected yes.
Whilst we broadly agree with the vision:
The vision of rural communities voluntarily running and operating electric bus services is not sustainable. It is beyond the collective ability of most communities to establish, maintain and fund such an aspiration.
We praise the emphasis placed on preserving economic stability and note Vision 2031's acknowledgement of Clare as a main tourist centre.
However, we advise that Clare's underlying economy of tourism will be compromised by proposed wind farm development sites surrounding the town.

Question 2: Draft Vision (see page 18)

a) Do you agree with the draft vision for the rural areas? Have any element's been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Have any elements been missed out which you feel should be included in the vision?

Whilst we broadly agree with the aspirations :
Clare is designated to take 20% of the new housing in the rural areas but our infrastructure is crumbling after many years of minimal authority investment. The emphasis on basing facilities in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, coupled with reduced public transport severely limits options for non-car owners. It is better to target money at improving facilities in Key Service Centres. Upgrading footpaths and cycle routes is commendable, but costly and cannot be accommodated by the Precept. There are no mechanisms to ensure that affordable housing goes to local people. These should be put in place to create a specific requirement which Clare Parish Council will insist upon for all affordable housing developments
There has been a significant increase in the size and weight of HGV using the A1092. This compromises pedestrian safety, the foundations and fabric of historic buildings, road surfaces, pavements and drainage systems. We therefore submit that the following be included:
The historic buildings and underlying road and infrastructure systems of rural villages and towns will be protected from the destructive effects of modern articulated HGV transit.
Given SEBC's commitment to reducing CO2 emissions, we also suggest:
All new developments should take maximum advantage of energy efficiency through solar panels for water heating and electricity.

Question 3: Cross-subject challenges (see page 20)

a) Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree that these are the key cross-subject challenges for the rural areas? Are there other significant cross subject challenges that have been missed? If so, please state what they are and why you think they are significant.

Development of Key Service Centres
Given: An ageing rural population The lack of transport and general mobility The need to encourage younger people to stay/move to rural areas The effect of internet shopping The need to reinvigorate local centre economies and local community involvement
We believe that far more emphasis should be place on developing Key Service Centres rather than the two main towns. This is particularly important in a rural vision document.

Question 4: Neighbourhood plans (Policy RV1)(see page 21)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV1 for neighbourhood plans/development orders for the rural areas?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Please set out any changes you would like to see.

It has always been the Parish Council's position that, subject to improved infra-structure, 100 houses is a more acceptable level to ensure maintenance of the character of Clare.
We believe that new developments should meet the requirements set out in the Prince's Foundation Community Capital Visioning - Looking After Home and Country section - advising that new developments should use local building styles.



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Questions 5: Draft objectives (see page 22)

a) Do you agree with the draft objectives for the rural areas?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Taking into account the fact these rural objectives must not repeat the core strategy objectives (see Appendix 4), do you think any elements have been missed out of the objectives which you feel should be included?

See answer to question 3

Question 6: Housing settlement boundaries (Policy RV2)(see page 24)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV2 on housing settlement boundaries?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Please set out any changes you would like to see.

Selected yes. Agree subject to concerns stated in letter.

Question 7: Phasing of development sites (see page 28)

a) Do you agree with the phasing periods detailed in this section?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you feel these periods will allow enough flexibility for the delivery of development in the rural areas?

It is likely that there will be a negative impact on commercial housing development in Clare if the proposed wind farm applications are accepted. The turbines as currently proposed are within 1 mile of the sites RV7a and RV7b and their proximity will be a material consideration for house purchasers.
Developments post 2021 may therefore not take place.

Question 8: Homes and communities aspirations (see page 30)

a) Do you agree with our homes and communities aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Question 9: Rural employment areas (Policy RV3) (see page 32)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV3 on rural employment areas?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

Question 10: Protection of specials uses (Policy RV4)(see page 33)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV4 on protection of special uses?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

Question 11: Jobs and economy aspirations (see page 33)

a) Do you agree with our jobs and economy aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Suggest strengthening commitment to developing tourism – this is particularly relevant to Clare and the need to settle the future of the Country Park.
 Suggest strengthening the commitment to upgrading the broadband infrastructure in Key Service and Local Service Centres.

Question 12: Travel aspirations (see page 35)

a) Do you agree with our travel aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Aspiration 4 does not fully recognise the problems of 40 ton HGV vehicles using the A1092 – significant danger to pedestrians, etc. Action should be taken to place weight restrictions on this road, especially as Haverhill industry is increased.
 Footpaths will need be upgraded if they are to be used on a daily basis by large numbers of people e.g. children journeying to school. Costs will be prohibitive for parish councils.

Question 13: Sustainability and climate change aspirations (see page 37)

a) Do you agree with our sustainability and climate change aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Strongly agree with the councils commitment to being 'sensitive to people's concerns about turbines' and its acknowledgement that 'wind turbines can be noisy and over-dominant in the landscape'. Strongly agree with support for homes to improve energy efficiency and use of low carbon generation schemes but commercial/industrial wind turbines would have a highly detrimental effect on the tourist economy in conservation areas and undermine the well-being of anyone living less than 2km from the turbines. We re-state our view that no industrial-scale windfarm development should take place within 2 kilometres of a residential dwelling

Question 14: Crime and safety aspirations (see page 39)

a) Do you agree with our crime and safety aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Provision for youth is a key priority for Clare and we would welcome support from SEBC in our drive to secure a permanent youth facility in one of the Clare Country Park buildings.

Question 15: Infrastructure and services aspirations (see page 42)

a) Do you agree with our infrastructure and services aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Suggest strengthening Aspiration 5 by providing support/advice to owners of current properties that are at an increased risk of flooding. Note that use of large amounts of concrete necessary to the building of wind turbines can impact adversely on water tables and flood areas.

Question 16: Culture and leisure aspirations (see page 45)

a) Do you agree with our culture and leisure aspirations?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Clare PC strongly agree with these aspirations and believe that many of them can be delivered through the Business Plan that it has been put together for Clare Country Park. The support of SEBC in progressing this plan would be much appreciated.



Question 17: Health and wellbeing aspirations (see page 47)

a) Do you agree with our health and wellbeing aspirations?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

It will be important to ensure that Clare has increased health practitioner facilities to cope with a potential 25% increase in households.

Question 18: Safeguarding educational establishments (Policy RV4a) (see page 50)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV4a on safeguarding educational establishments?

yes

no

no opinion

Question 19: Education and skills aspirations (see page 50)

a) Do you agree with our educational and skills aspirations?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Travelling to and from Clare Primary School and Stour Valley Community School remains a major issue in spite of dedicated work undertaken by the schools and CPC Highways committee. Future expansion of both schools seems likely by 2031 and will need to be planned for. Issues of parking, safe walking routes through the town and crossing busy roads to get to school will become more pressing. The siting of a development on the Cavendish road poses particular safety problems for children accessing the Primary school (see letter).

Question 20: Unique and special character (see page 52)

a) Do you feel we need a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Are there any parts of the rural area (outside existing conservation areas) which you feel should be protected due to their special unique character? Please set out your reasons.

St Edmundsbury should incorporate a special policy in this document to help protect areas of unique and special character. Clare Parish Council strongly supports the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project. Its proven success in historic and natural environment projects, together with the positive impact on tourism should justify specific inclusion. We would strongly recommend that Clare and the surrounding countryside should be protected by inclusion in the AONB and Stour Valley Project.



Question 21: Green infrastructure (Policy RV5) (page 54)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV5 on green infrastructure?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Please set out any changes you would like to see.

Selected yes. Clare Parish Council agree with the Historic and Natural Environment aspirations, however successful delivery would be heavily dependent upon significant co-operation from landowners.

Question 22: Historic and natural environment aspirations (see page 54)

a) Do you agree with our historic and natural environment aspirations?

- yes
 no
 no opinion

b) Do you agree with the actions we propose to take to achieve our aspirations?

Question 23: Barrow (Policy RV6)(see page 59)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV6 on Barrow?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 24: Clare (Policy RV7)(see page 64)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV7 on Clare?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Clare Parish Council supports the broad thrust of Vision 2031, although it has concerns about the delivery of a number of aspects of the very wide-ranging agenda proposed, given both sustained pressure on public spending and the further pressure that many initiatives will inevitably place on voluntary action in local communities.

We are very happy to acknowledge Clare as a Key Service Centre. There is a strong desire across the Town to enhance further what can be offered to the community and the surrounding villages that we serve. This is reflected in the Clare Community Plan and the more recent Parish Council 4-year (2012-16) Development Plan (summary attached) that has received widespread endorsement. We wish to ensure that Clare continues to be a vibrant and attractive place to live or visit, in economic and cultural terms, but that the character, heritage and environmental aspects of the Town are preserved. In other words, a continuing balance must be struck between development and conservation.

Our detailed responses to the Questions posed in the Consultation are given in the appendix. The remainder of this letter addresses matters related specifically to proposed future development in Clare, the Parish Council's views on which have been articulated on a number of occasions. For clarity, these are re-stated here in the context of the Consultation Document.

A major concern for us is the lack of infrastructure investment in Clare over the years. We do not believe that Clare has benefitted proportionately from the infrastructure investment undertaken by the Borough in recent years, and many of the problems highlighted below stem from this lack of investment.

Housing Development and Density

The Consultation indicates the building of 199 new homes in Clare in three major green-field developments with high density levels. There is also the potential for development on brown-field sites previously identified within

the Town. The three proposed developments alone represent an increase of nearly 25% in our housing stock, and have the potential dramatically to alter the character of the Town and further over-load already stretched infrastructure services. We repeat our view that development should be limited to some 100 houses in total a very significant proportion should be affordable/social housing, ideally for those with familial connections to Clare all development should be sympathetic to the character of the Town in terms of style and density growth should where possible be on brown-field sites, close to the centre and with good access open spaces should be provided or maintained regard should be paid to limiting flood risk and ensuring satisfactory dispersal of surface water and sewage an integrated approach should be taken to development so that roads and other infrastructure are planned with likely future developments in mind. One example of this would be road access through land East of the Granary to land behind Nethergate Street.

Our comments on the individual sites are given below.

Utilities Infrastructure

We remain concerned about the adequacy of the existing utilities (gas, electricity, water, telecommunications) infrastructure given the number of problems that occur within the Town. Increased housing will inevitably add to these problems. Our view remains that an early audit of utilities infrastructure in Clare should be undertaken and the results made available to us any issues identified should be dealt with before any significant development takes place

Transport Infrastructure

The lack of adequate parking facilities near the centre of the Town has long been a major issue which remains unresolved despite our many representations. Problems also exist in terms of the inadequacy of public transport links, whilst further significant issues have also arisen with HGV traffic causing major disruption, and speeding vehicles threatening pedestrian (particularly child) safety. Planned developments in Clare, Haverhill and elsewhere in the Borough will only add to these problems. All of these matters impact on our ability to function effectively as a Key Service Centre. Our view is that the provision of a central car park in Clare should be a high priority for the Borough real efforts should be made to ensure the adequacy of public transport links to Key Service Centres every opportunity, particularly in relation to planned development, should be taken with the Highways Authority to introduce traffic-calming measures efforts, eg weight restrictions/planning agreements should be made to restrict unnecessary HGV traffic from the A1092

Community Infrastructure

Clare has a thriving community with many organisations and activities on offer. It has satisfactory community facilities in terms of health care, although lacks a dental practice. The current uncertainties over the future of the Library and Clare Castle Country Park are unhelpful and the Parish Council continues to work to achieve sustainable community solutions. Our view is that any housing development must ensure commensurate and demonstrable investment in community facilities and health and social services

RV7a Land East of The Granary

A Planning Application has just been received in respect of this site and our detailed comments on that application will follow in due course. Our initial observations are that it is a green-field site, within the Conservation Area, with high density housing proposed and therefore does not fit with our general view expressed above. Particular concerns relate to access arrangements to and from Stoke Road and the likely additional pressure placed on utilities infrastructure, particularly surface and foul water drainage. All weather pedestrian access to the High Street and the Primary School will be an essential pre-requisite.

RV7b Land rear of Nethergate Street

This is also a proposed high-density green-field site, within the Conservation Area and close to a number of historic properties. It is a popular area for walkers, and is particularly important because it is an area of countryside very close to the centre of the Town. It therefore does not fit with our general view expressed above. It is also the designated location for a car park, albeit that development is not planned before 2021. Our urgent need is for a car park now rather than in 9+ years' time and, as stated above, we wish this to be a priority action for the Borough.

Apart from the potential impact on the character of the Town from a site containing high-density housing, a car park and B1 commercial use premises, a significant issue will be the provision of satisfactory access to

and from the site, given its distance from the road and the fact that it will have more than residential traffic requiring entry. If this site is to be developed, our view is that it should contain a smaller number of properties, with a mix of styles all sympathetic to the location, but with a reasonable proportion of social and affordable accommodation. Given its location, it should also benefit from significant open space and tree landscaping. All the points made above concerning infrastructure also, of course, apply.

RV7c Land off Cavendish Road

This is a green-field site that is not in the Conservation Area, but does have planned high-density housing. Our major concern with this site, apart from density, is that pedestrian access to the centre of the Town is poor. The pavements are of variable width in Cavendish Road, and at Bell Corner they are dangerous, with lorries frequently mounting them and knocking over the concrete bollards. This site would require extensive investment in pedestrian infrastructure, both in terms of Cavendish Road and in the provision of a new footpath to the centre of the Town via the playing fields. (See attached 4 year plan for consultation)



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Question 25: Ixworth (Policy RV8)(see page 68)

a) Did you agree with the draft policy RV8 on Ixworth?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 26: Ixworth housing settlement boundary (see page 68)

a) Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?

yes

no

no opinion

Question 27: Kedington (Policy RV9)(see page 71)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV9 on Kedington?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 28: Kedington housing settlement boundary (see page 72)

a) Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?

- yes
- no
- no opinion



Question 29: Stanton (Policy RV10)(see page 75)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV10 on Stanton?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 30: Stanton housing settlement boundary (see page 75)

a) Do you agree with the proposed changes to the housing settlement boundaries?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Question 31: Bardwell (see page 78)

a) Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Bardwell up in 2031?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Question 32: Barningham (Policy RV11)(see page 81)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Barningham?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 33: Cavendish (Policy RV12)(see page 84)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV11 on Cavendish?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Question 34: Chedburgh (Policy RV13)(see page 87)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV13 on Chedburgh?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take into account in the policy?

Question 35: Great Barton (Policy RV14)(see page 91)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV14 on Great Barton?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 36: Great Barton north east growth (see page 91)

a) Do you agree that long-term growth should take place on land to the north east of Great Barton?

yes

no

no opinion

Question 37: Great Barton use of land (see page 91)

a) As well as housing, what other uses would you like to see developed in the long term on this area of land, such as retail, community facilities, and so on?

Question 38: Great and Little Thurlow (see page 93)

a) Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any new sites for development in Great and Little Thurlow for the period up to 2031?

yes

no

no opinion



Question 39: Great and Little Whelnetham (Policy RV15) (see page 96)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV15 on Great and Little Whelnetham?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 40: Hopton (Policy RV16) (see page 100)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV16 on Hopton?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 41: Hundon (see page 102)

a) Do you agree with the proposal to not allocate any specific sites for development in Hundon up to 2031?

yes

no

no opinion

Question 42: Ingham (Policy RV17) (see page 105)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV17 on Ingham?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Question 43: Risby (Policy RV18)(see page 109)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV18 on Risby?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 44: Rougham (Policy RV19)(see page 112)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV19 on Rougham?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 45: Rougham housing settlement boundary (see page 113)

a) Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?

yes

no

no opinion

Question 46: Wickhambrook Policy RV20 (see page 117)

a) Do you agree with the draft policy RV20 on Wickhambrook?

yes

no

no opinion

b) Are there any other issues you feel we need to take account of in the policy?

Question 47: Wickhambrook housing settlement boundary (see page 117)

a) Do you agree with the proposed change to the housing settlement boundary?

yes

no

no opinion

Are there any other comments you would like to make on the document?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this response form.