

Attention Chris Board - further to my telephone call ...

Regarding planned development north west of Haverhill SE/09/1283

In the past: the area HAV2 has been designated a strategic Greenfield site protecting residents of Boyton Hall from the proposed relief road.

Currently the new plots at Boyton Woods at the top of Anne Suckling Road were to fulfil a need ...' to create more high quality homes to improve the range of housing available...' and 'Ordinarily these plots would have been zoned for higher density properties but we believe the town must offer a better choice'. Suddenly the converse is true.

In the future the 1150 houses will be termed affordable housing created in a low density by offering large open spaces between the rows of terraces to reduce the numbers: ie low cost housing but with spaces or a 'Chalkstone estate spread over a wider area'.

1. The invitation to view the proposal was carefully worded to avoid alarming the residents and omitted entirely the number of houses or type being proposed.
2. Our search documents when buying 49 Falklands Road in 2011, noted 165 houses implying a small estate of detached premium houses, not 1150 affordable stock in long rows of terraces. The documents note that only 40 % will be 'affordable' but this only refers to the 1st Tranche. It appears that a higher overall percentage of the total will be 'affordable' as the design repeats itself. Indeed the high standard houses at Boyton Woods will back onto terraces.
3. There is no need for a north west bypass, the town itself is rarely congested and where is this traffic going to? The southern bypass serves industrial estates so logically an Eastern bypass must be required to complete the ring. This will isolate the town centre even further and would increase traffic on the A1017 to Colchester - another poor road in spite of its A status.
4. Haverhill was classed as a commuter town by the Council attendants at the viewing, so people are going to and from, not around. A Linton bypass or dualling the A1307 would make more sense. Logically any traffic using the bypass would be coming from Cambridge and going to Bury St Edmunds so why not use the A14? If Haverhill is to be a feeder town for Cambridge - why not build these houses nearer Cambridge and reduce the carbon footprint? The A143 has no overtaking areas and has had a number of serious accidents in recent years, attracting more traffic to this route (as the bypass is no doubt designed to do), will increase this figure.
5. Where are the 1150 new families coming from? What skills and trades will they bring. Already the Town Council do not submit expenses due to the poverty level in the town, so who is being targeted to be attracted here?
6. Haverhill is an unemployment black spot for young people, so why introduce more people into a town that cannot cope with what it already has. A look at the jobs available will show most to be low grade or part time.
7. The scheme does not appear on the 2031 Vision by Bury St Edmunds
8. A look at any map will show that Haverhill is in the middle of poor transport routes in a box of the M11, A11, A14, A134, and A120.
9. Boyton Hall is currently a premium place to live with houses selling fast due to their desirability. This will blight those houses.
10. There is no consideration to improve the Doctors facilities in the town which are already overloaded, taking 3 weeks to get an appointment.
11. There should be sustainable transport but an old fashioned bus is proposed.

12. Town centre parking is very restricted and could not cope. By not addressing this, the town centre - already sporting £ shops, will steadily decline and die.
13. The Bidwells document 4.2.10 bullet point 2 indentifies that the new development should 'integrate with the existing urban form' – why then is affordable housing being thrust on top of premium housing whereas it should be placed in the pocket next to Samuel Ward School and north of the existing affordable housing on the Chalkstone estate.
14. There are plans only for a primary school implying that the resident will be young with small growing families. Again - where are these families coming from? Why should they be attracted to Haverhill?
15. The fallow ground to the west of Anne Suckling Road / Falklands Road is currently enjoyed by the local residents as a haven for wild life, exercise and dog walking. Hardly a moment goes by when someone is not on this field. Once this is swallowed up by the new development this amenity will be lost.
16. The Council were requested to turn back on the street lights in this area to reduce any possibility of crime - this was refused on the grounds that here was no crime. Can we have a guarantee that this will continue after the low cost house owners move in?
17. Haverhill has a low crime rate due to the lack of confidence that any crime reported will be investigated. as an example during a recent beating in the town centre, the 2 Police in attendance watched and did nothing. A passer by encouraged them to stop the fight and when they again refused he tried to take their shoulder tab numbers, but was then threatened with arrest, himself.
18. We have no objection to the Bypass being built but question its need, and the poor quality of the roads feeding it. In other words there will be bottle necks either side. In addition if it does attract more traffic – most of this will be lorries which are limited to 40mph, further increasing the commute time to and from the commuter town of Haverhill, increasing frustration and increasing accidents.
19. We note the Strategic Green field Site Hav 2 – why was this designated a Greenfield Site if it can be so swiftly altered to become affordable housing. If houses are to be built here they should integrate with the existing ie premium housing stock such as Boyton Woods.

I believe the Council has been economical with the Planning process and only releasing the minimum of information so that minimal objections will be raised. Indeed issuing the invitation to view the proposal locally, at the height of the holiday season just after the schools had broken up, for only 2 evenings, and requiring comments back within 10 days, (to allow for post) could be viewed as underhand

The staff on hand at the viewing should have been better briefed on what was proposed, as they were unable to answer the most basic questions. Maybe this was deliberate.

I believe that there are fundamental flaws in the scope, design, layout, and legality of proceeding with this development and formally object to it in its present concept.

Yours faithfully M C Stott by email

49 Falklands Road Haverhill CB9 0EA