

Site 1 Near (ie. walking distance) to Aggies piece, village centre and village hall.

Sites 1,2 and 4 would involve losing swathes of open and picturesque countryside

Dangerous turn off site could become rat run.

Floods badly so huge water issues.

Site 1 not seen as viable site due to the construction and eventual residential traffic using Church Road which is already very busy

Sites 1 and 5 should not have been considered as they are sites of natural beauty.

Flood plain.

No to building here (a) wildlife conservation (b) narrow roads and blind bends (c) flooding (d) footpaths (e) remains of medieval moat (f) excess traffic during build phase and completion. Dangerous

This site has been flooded in recent weeks so does not seem appropriate for houses. Also it will increase traffic through the village for commuting in and out and what about the wildlife haven that has been created there.

Site 1 would unnecessarily increase traffic flow through heart of village already badly affected by DPD etc based in East Harling.

Sites 1 and 4 are unsuitable as they both exit onto narrow country roads.

Site 1 would require traffic to use Pound Corner to access the village which because of its close proximity to and poor vision from Bishops Croft, would be hazardous to residents of Bishops Croft. Flooding is also a problem with this site and could affect adjacent properties if built on.

Site not suitable with all the flooding that occurs at the bottom of the plot by the river. Also road entrance to the plot not suitable for extra traffic. The bends at Pound Corner, ie. Church Road to Sandy Lane north is a very bad junction. The Coney Weston road to Sandy Lane also bad.

Lots of woodland birds can be seen in this area.

Site 2 would remove any of the objections around sewers and drains as it lies between village and waterworks so avoids much of the current and stressed infrastructure.

Only site where easy access is available.

Sites 2,3 and 5 are most suitable as they have less impact on other residents and all exit onto the B1111 giving good vision for traffic exiting onto the B1111.

Could accommodate a community building.

Near (ie. walking distance) to Aggies piece, village centre and village hall.

We feel site 2 is the better site as it would have better access to go directly onto the B1111.

Sites 1,2 and 4 would involve losing swathes of open and picturesque countryside.

No to building here due to wildlife conservation, narrow roads and blind bends and excess traffic during build phase and completion.

Site 2 extends the village beyond current building line when there is land available at sites 3 and 4 which could be utilised.

Site 3 Two smaller sites (3 and 5) would be less intrusive and nearer main road (in terms of traffic, construction and disruption). More of an extension to existing housing sites.

3 and 5 appear to utilise underdeveloped areas of the village. If building was split across these sites it would prevent overdevelopment of one area and stop the village from “sprawling” into the open countryside.

As a family we believe that site 3 is the most sensible solution since it continues the existing new development and has minimal visual impact on the village. Although cars would need to go through the village to access the A143 to Diss/Bury, new occupants are just as likely to go the opposite way on commute to access the B1066. Walking distances are still minimal to centre of the village. There is also the possibility of access onto the Stanton Rides footpaths for residents. Should more site space be needed, site 4 offers a possible extension area. Residents of site 3 could cut down Sandy Lane to gain access to Aggies piece and village hall.

Site 3 (or part site 3 and part site 4: behind new estate) would be best site. Doesn't affect overall look of the village. Provides pedestrian access and was already anticipated as being built on.

Sites 2,3 and 5 are most suitable as they have less impact on other residents and all exit onto the B1111 giving good vision for traffic exiting onto the B1111.

The main reason for site 4 is it will avoid the centre of the village down past the church

Site 4 (or part site 3 and part site 4: behind new estate) would be best site. Doesn't affect overall look of the village. Provides pedestrian access and was already anticipated as being built on.

Sites 1,2 and 4 would involve losing swathes of open and picturesque countryside

Any building on site 4 on Hepworth Road would be causing further issues with drainage – Hepworth Road soakaway drains In the road have been full to the top most of the winter with them not soaking away.

Drainage and access issues.

If site 4 is developed, our concern is that traffic from it will turn left to avoid the 30mph into Barningham and out from the staggered junction and either drive through Hepworth village to join the A143 or through North Common to join the B1111. Hepworth village also has housing plans and North Common is a single track road and not at all suitable for increased traffic.

No to building here due to wildlife conservation, flooding, narrow roads and blind bends and excess traffic during build phase and completion and national speed limit.

3 and 5 appear to utilise underdeveloped areas of the village. If building was split across these sites it would prevent overdevelopment of one area and stop the village from “sprawling” into the open countryside.

Sites 2,3 and 5 are most suitable as they have less impact on other residents and all exit onto the B1111 giving good vision for traffic exiting onto the B1111.

Two smaller sites (3 and 5) would be less intrusive and nearer main road (in terms of traffic, construction and disruption). More of an extension to existing housing sites

Sites 1 and 5 should not have been considered as they are sites of natural beauty.

No decent access to this area.

No to building here due to wildlife conservation, narrow roads and blind bends and excess traffic during build phase and completion. Also traffic in this area would be cause for concern as the B1111 is in national speed limit currently, other access into village is too narrow especially at school drop off and collection time.

The water table in the area is extremely high hence the regular flooding in Bardwell Road. The egress onto the B1111 is potentially very dangerous.

The underground services are very old and would not cope with housing.

Site 5 has no paved pedestrian access to village centre which 3 and 4 do provide but it would possibly slow traffic from Stanton on B1111.

Plot 5 would need to check for Barn Owls as we see two of them regularly flying across from this location and across the fields.

Site 1 - what about the wildlife haven that has been created there.

Your proposal for site 5 would have a disastrous effect on the wildlife that inhabit the area. Nesting Barn Owls hunt over the grassland. Tawny Owls also seen regularly. Monjacs and Roedeers inhabit the area as do pheasant and rabbit.

We have concerns for the wildlife sites 3 and 4; deer, hares rabbits and birds live and roam here.

Lots of woodland birds can be seen in this area.

If plot 5 is to be considered, the 30mph speed limit needs to be extended to Drouts Lane.

Site 1 not seen as viable site due to the construction and eventual residential traffic using Church Road which is already very busy.

To ensure good traffic flow the staggered junction in the centre of the village needs a roundabout.

Roads can't take the volume of traffic.

Site 1 would unnecessarily increase traffic flow through heart of village already badly affected by DPD etc based in East Harling.

Site 4 would increase traffic flow into Hepworth Road and create greater risk to vehicles and pedestrians at junction with B1111 which is partially blind towards Hopton

Any of these projects will increase the volume of traffic in the village.

Parking facilities at shop and school are limited.

As traffic is already high we would like to see any access direct onto B1111.

Frankly, I don't want any development in the village but appreciate people need to live somewhere.

I do not believe that this is necessary for Barningham. We have beautiful scenery here and if more houses come popping up this will be ruined. I also believe that I won't be the only one saying this bold statement alone. Please reconsider this proposal. I can understand the amount of money this can make and the jobs it will provide for hundreds of people but consider the cost of lives it will affect doing this.

NO HOUSES

I want no houses

Barningham should not be expanded. The village already suffers from congestion around the shop and school and our bus service has been

decimated over recent years meaning even more cars travelling to and from the village causing more environmental damage.

I believe any increase in the population must be accompanied by an appropriate increase in community facilities.

There seems little point in building a new hall/community building as the current hall is underutilised and may just benefit from an upgrade.

Would prefer a bigger site that can provide additional amenities for the village to use. Eg. New hall

We need something for kids and a new village hall.

Any major development should come with a new community centre. The old village hall site should be used for social housing.

It would be good to have a community building as the current village hall is not very inviting and the parking is not adequate. Look at Bardwell and Sapiston! Excellent facilities.

Could accommodate a community building

What will a community building provide? Doctors surgery, dentist ??

The old village hall site should be used for social housing

Houses are built for out of village people so no accommodation for young couples just starting out.

Any building on site 4 on Hepworth Road would be causing further issues with drainage – Hepworth Road soakaway drains In the road have been full to the top most of the winter with them not soaking away.

Plot 1 - Floods badly so huge water issues.

This year has identified two areas of major flooding in the village resulting in roads becoming impassable. To that end, building in these two areas would only worsen the problem greatly. The areas of concern are obviously side of site 1, the road to Coney Weston and Aggies Piece.

The drainage can't take what is already here. Water main not big enough; too old.

Site 1 - This site has been flooded in recent weeks so does not seem appropriate for houses

Site 5 - The water table in the area is extremely high hence the regular flooding in Bardwell Road

Site 1 - Flooding is also a problem with this site and could affect adjacent properties if built on.

Don't see proximity to Aggie's piece as a consideration for any development.

It is so far out of the village that any proposed development would need a pedestrian plan to allow people to reach the site safely.

Would prefer a bigger site that can provide additional amenities for the village to use. Eg. New hall, bigger play park with better range of equipment, football pitch or similar, more pavement routes for walking, and also consideration of a more suitable building for village shop with better access and parking.

With more houses it would be ideal to have further shops, village buildings and play areas. Roads will also need attention.

When building additional housing it is essential to ensure there will be sufficient school places and safe access to the school, enough capacity at a GP surgery to take those extra patients and suitable roads and road junctions. To ensure good traffic flow the staggered junction in the centre of the village needs a roundabout.

Walking time of less than ten minutes to the centre of the village should not be considered a negative.

I have no problem with the two sites I have chosen (2 and 4) provided services/facilities don't drop away.

If one house is built that is two cars. The school will not take any more pupils. Already one portacabin.

Buses don't run to places Doctors, Dentists, Hospital at convenient times so car or taxi needed.

Consider the following: new location for shop; land for self build.

Having recently moved to Millfield Road but not knowing about the building proposals, we would be opposed to plot 4 as it damages the views we sought when purchasing the house. It is also disappointing that the previous consultation ran so close to Christmas and a busy period for all. On the whole we are content with 1,2 and 5. We also have no objection to two smaller developments.

Any housing added needs to have minimal impact on existing housing and wildlife.

Site 1 Not too far from shop, church or pub.

Site 1 and 4 do not have immediate access to the main B111.

Site 1 would bring more vehicles into the village for access to the B111 passing the church, pub, school and shop to an already congested junction.

Access at some points along Church Road is already tricky when pulling onto the road due to traffic speed/flow from the 2 roads adjoining the triangle at Pound Corner.

Site 1 has been badly flooded in the last few years and the road by Aggie's Piece and The Piece itself have been unusable due to flooding. Coney Weston Road itself suffers with flooding with the road also impassable.

Site 1 has an abundance of wildlife which would be disturbed and possibly not return during and after development.

Please ensure drains and sewers capable of extra housing. Site 1 was flooded in recent heavy rainfall.

Site 1 has shown in recent weeks to flood at times extensively. I think this site should be avoided.

To build houses on Site 1 would be foolish – so much more traffic through the village Centre.

Sites 1 & 4 would cause a problem at Church/Hepworth Roads junction.

Site 1 – has been waterlogged and contributed to the flooding of Aggie's.

Site 1 & Site 2 No development of any kind should be considered on either of these sites it would have a huge negative impact on the rural village scene, & unnecessary loss of prime agricultural land.

Site 1 & surrounding area already suffers with flooding, regular surface water & drainage issues.

Sites 1 & 4 would mean more traffic coming out on the shop crossroad, which is already quite dangerous.

Site 2/3/5 seem to be the only sensible options as they all have immediate and non restrictive access to the B111 and A143 thereafter.

A community Centre would only be financially viable if a developer put up the money – but Site 2 would be practical – always supposing this somewhat inactive village would make use of it.

Reason for choosing Sites 2 & 3 is because access is out onto a large road where it's still 30mph and good visibility.

Site 2 – has been waterlogged as well and must also add to the flooding of Aggie's and on the Hopton Road.

Site 1 & Site 2 No development of any kind should be considered on either of these sites it would have a huge negative impact on the rural village scene, & unnecessary loss of prime agricultural land.

Site 2/3/5 seem to be the only sensible options as they all have immediate and non restrictive access to the B111 and A143 thereafter.

Drainage already in place from phase 1.

Development as indicated for Site 3 will not greatly extend the boundaries of the village and the speed restrictions will not necessarily need adjusting further out into the countryside.

Reason for choosing Sites 2 & 3 is because access is out onto a large road where it's still 30mph and good visibility.

Housing should be built on Site 4. It is ideal either as an extension of the existing Millfield Road or from Hepworth Road. It has the least impact of all sites in respect of proximity criteria used in the Sustainability Approach of the West Suffolk Local Plan (interim ??A report) as adopted by the council in October 2020.

Site 1 and 4 do not have immediate access to the main B111.

Site 4 would also bring more traffic to the junction to access the B111, the Hepworth Road itself is prone to traffic coming into Barningham from Hepworth.

Building on Site 4 would also bring more traffic to our crossroads.

Sites 1 & 4 would cause a problem at Church/Hepworth Roads junction.

No to access from Hepworth Road to Site 4 – any additional traffic trying to access B111 would cause havoc to an already hazardous junction unless the assumption is everyone will access the A143 via Hepworth village.

Part of Site 4 is already hedged? Why sprawl into open countryside?

Sites 1 & 4 would mean more traffic coming out on the shop crossroad, which is already quite dangerous.

Site 2/3/5 seem to be the only sensible options as they all have immediate and non restrictive access to the B111 and A143 thereafter.

If only for 34 houses that site [5] would allow access straight onto B111 and not come through the village so surely that is the answer.

Site 5, whilst the smallest, is clearly the best option as it has the least impact on other housing and all the benefits listed in the documents.

Site 5 would appear to have the least impact on the appearance of the village.

...but surely the most ideal location for the mandatory growth within the village must be area 5 on the Stanton side of the village. Development on area 5 allows for a central village location adjacent to the village facilities, including the shop, the school, the bus stops, and the church; it would benefit from easy access from both Bardwell and the B111 Stanton roads and development here could have the added benefit of introducing active traffic calming measures on the village approach. The plot is more than suitable in size for the 30 properties required, even with decent sized gardens and open areas. Building on this Western side of the village would provide the future occupants with good access to the A143 and more direct access to the doctors' surgery in Stanton.

Site 5 – blind bend & traffic speed on Stanton Road.

No to development on this site (5) a large section of hedge would need to be removed to provide vision & play again a negative impact of rural scene. Also loss of mature pasture probably undisturbed for many years.

Option 5 is in close proximity to listed buildings and there is insufficient land to form a path along Bardwell Road.

Number 5 entrance would be outside 30mph limit & visibility would be poor. Also plot is not very big.

Site 1 has an abundance of wildlife which would be disturbed and possibly not return during and after development.

Buzzards appear to live in the woodland around Site 1 and can be seen over Site 2.

Regarding the identified plots, future planning must take into consideration the hedgerows and species diversity. Area 3 and the SE of area 4 are home to hedgehogs, grass snakes, hares, woodpeckers, owls and bats – all protected species and we regularly see roe deer, hawks and hear badgers. The land fallow to the South of Lingwood and the East of Millfield has recently been reported to contain rare plant and fauna colonies of particular interest. The enclosed field behind Millfield should be left as a nature reserve as it has not been cultivated for many years and the hedge surrounding it is a haven for wildlife. Owls hunt in there and the hedgerow is home to so many creatures.

If houses are permitted in any location other than area 5 wide wildlife corridors should be left, and housing should be low density. This is after all a village, not a town.

I do not think there is a need for a community building as we already have a good village hall that meets all requirements. Do not think a community building will be used, so a waste of money. Building on outer edge of village would be preferable especially for ease of traffic, and water overflow problems and not overlooked too much to spoil nice countryside views. Do hope Council are taking into consideration the strain it will put on Doctors and schools for a further amount of population. Can they handle it? Do not want to spoil countryside and peace!

Site 4 would also bring more traffic to the junction to access the B111, the Hepworth Road itself is prone to traffic coming into Barningham from Hepworth.

Site 2/3/5 seem to be the only sensible options as they all have immediate and non restrictive access to the B111 and A143 thereafter.

If only for 34 houses that site [5] would allow access straight onto B111 and not come through the village so surely that is the answer.

To build houses on Site 1 would be foolish – so much more traffic through the village Centre.

Building on Site 4 would also bring more traffic to our crossroads.

Site 5 – blind bend & traffic speed on Stanton Road.

The roads do not currently cope well with the existing quantity of traffic, there is frequent congestion and many close calls near the shop corner due to the speed of approaching vehicles from the Stanton direction. The approach to the village from Hopton regularly suffers from roadside erosion and flooding during rains and the speed of drivers using the B111 as a “Rabbit Run” make the Hopton Road stretch difficult to navigate by pedestrians or to access from Sandy Lane, Lingwood Close, Hopton Road and Millfield Road.

No to access from Hepworth Road to Site 4 – any additional traffic trying to access B111 would cause havoc to an already hazardous junction unless the assumption is everyone will access the A143 via Hepworth village.

Two members in household, one of whom is against any housing development.

Why do we need more houses? The village is becoming too large. IF we we have to have any, we prefer a small number on the two sites selected [3, 4], with infrastructure already in place.

I am totally against any further houses in the village There is no infrastructure for this, no matter how many houses are considered. The school is full, the Spar shop is inadequate, the surgery GP in Stanton does not accept any further patient as no capacity. The roads are not set for any more cars. I didn't move to a lovely village such as Barningham, with the beautiful features I have from my doorstep to end in a town. There are other places for this, if necessary. I don't believe the bus route is

sufficient either. I refuse that further houses are built. They are other necessary renovations, such as the Council houses, which are a priority, more important and better use of the money than creating new homes and bringing more families who will be disappointed by the lack of facilities. Please do not go ahead with this ad/unacceptable decision. Thank you.

We don't agree with any of your sites proposed for housing. Barningham is overpopulated already & further housing will only create more problems with volume of traffic going through the village. I do not agree with any of the proposed housing sites. Barningham is already over developed & is too small for any additional housing.

Barningham does not need any further development. The infrastructure doesn't exist to maintain current population. 1) Drs overloaded 2) No good bus service – unable to get to Drs on buses 3) drains, sewers unable to cope with present population/recent rainfall proves that 4) Road access dangerous from sites 5) School overloaded

Ideas for consideration 1) Relocate village hall redevelop this site with affordable first time purchase properties? Improve- regenerate the area.

Drains, new ones of course, but the village could get flooding when we get a lot of rain in winter.

Site 1 has been badly flooded in the last few years and the road by Aggie's Piece and The Piece itself have been unusable due to flooding. Coney Weston Road itself suffers with flooding with the road also impassable.

Please ensure drains and sewers capable of extra housing. Site 1 was flooded in recent heavy rainfall.

Site 1 has shown in recent weeks to flood at times extensively. I think this site should be avoided.

Site 1 – flood plain?

Site 1 – has been waterlogged and contributed to the flooding of Aggie's.

Site 2 – has been waterlogged as well and must also add to the flooding of Aggie's and on the Hopton Road.

Flooding of roads around the village has been bad and any building work should be carefully considered.

The East of area 4, the South of area 2 (adjacent to the B111)) and area 1 are particularly prone to water pooling and flooding on a large scale during the heavier rains and the general drainage of sites to the north east of the village may likely need significant upgrade to support future development. The north edge of area 2 is on a well-drained ridge and could be suited to development as could the Hepworth Road edge of area 4...

Site 1 & surrounding are already suffers with flooding, regular surface water & drainage issues.

And could the village hall site be reused?

But can the village cope effectively with extra housing, can the electric, water cope?

If we wanted to use Aggie's Piece we would use Sandy Lane, why are sites 2/3 not able to use this, Aggie's Piece itself is overgrown and poorly maintained.

The community Centre we already have is in my opinion more than adequate for the village but is underused due to lack of organised parking, access to playground also there. Barningham is already at capacity for schools and amenities, no option for no houses.

We understand that growth is a natural part of progression, we have considered proposal carefully.

Quite surprised plan says there is pedestrian access to Aggie's while there are no pavements available. Construction of pavements throughout and from village is much needed.

2 people in house agree!

Please consider sewerage system in the village.

No matter how small, it will lead to more houses, without infrastructure improvements, drainage, sewerage, roads, internet, school, it will be too much for existing services, sort that out, no bother. And don't insult intelligence by "directing" people to Plot 5. This is ill thought out and badly presented – no more houses with infrastructure improvements.

Many people who have chosen to live in the serenity of a "country village" find it incomprehensible as to why councillors feel the need to eradicate the individuality of a 'village' and turn it into a massive housing estate – all character gone – just copious amounts of houses with wide barren roads to accommodate countless cars. Just a small town, without the amenities. Such a shame.

Ideally the location of any additional homes would be where there is as little impact on other village residents and their homes as possible yet with a focus on maintaining the central "hub" like feel of Barningham. Wherever is chosen I believe that significant road infrastructure changes would be required to support further development of Barningham on the scale proposed.

I do not believe that the village needs a new community building however I do believe that's need better pedestrian access to Stanton. The existing facilities need to be utilised more effectively as the village hall is poorly supported and the sports equipment suffers continuous vandalism. The cost of the upkeep of a new facility would be considerable, and of no real benefit above what is already provided.

Mill Road to traffic free except for access.

The infrastructure of the utility services to the village are on their limit. Witness the water running down the middle of Church Road every time we have heavy or

prolonged rainfall and the flickering electric lights in a thunder/electrical storm. This does not bode well for any further large development.

[Site 3] This site does offer good access to B111 but only if absolutely necessary for additional housing. This could also provide access to part of Site 4 – to extend Lingwood Close. It would make sense to have a decent sized access road to enable development of Site 4 without the need of encroaching on additional land off Hepworth Road.

Ideas for consideration 1) Relocate village hall redevelop this site with affordable first time purchase properties? Improve- regenerate the area 2) To reduce traffic/parking issues at the shop junction – re-site shop? Or quicker & cheaper solution – encourage Spar to improve car park at the rear *remove redundant shed * resurface * sort out coned off area. Discourage parking in front of shop? Remove lay-by – dangerous for car users & shoppers. Utilise pub car park? I do hope the neighbourhood plan is more than just new homes! The return sheet implies that I am content with or want additional housing in the village? Whilst I appreciate that this may be out of our control I do question the constant drive for new homes in rural communities. I would hope that much more thought will be given, questions asked & concerns of village residents taken on board before any further decisions are made. The criteria to identify & select suitable sites is questionable. All sites are accessible to Aggie's, why Aggie's? We live and enjoy a rural village – walking in the countryside one does not expect pedestrian access. The last 12 months has proved this with so many local residents enjoying lovely walks in the countryside – without footpaths/pavements. Trying to reduce traffic through the village Centre makes sense, but more houses means more traffic. The B111 is a main road through the village, & direct access onto this should be a consideration – but you cannot assume everyone is going to Bury!

The whole approach of this document encourages division in the village. The ethos of the Parish Council should surely be to aid community cohesion. The working party has woefully made a consultation paper that is purely pitting one are of the village against another. Further more the Parish Council has provided its own opinion in a manner that could be seen as biased, pre-decided and distorted to a particular opinion by way of its choice of criteria. Nobody should be asked to tick a box for development on a site without any information about the quantity and type of buildings that are likely to be placed there, or without knowing how much of that land will be utilised. With all due respect to the working party who have given their time and efforts for Barningham the summary of sites and assessment criteria are ridiculous. All areas are close to the village Centre, it is not that large a village. People do not travel in directions that comply with set criteria, they take the route that suits them and not necessarily to the main roads. For example no consideration has been given to the large number of people already driving not walking their children to the village school. All passing one way or another through the village centre via congested Church Road, Bardwell Road and Mill Road. Having Aggie's Piece as a criteria is absurd. Anybody who is capable of walking inside that area is capable of walking to it from any site in the village, All access is pedestrian as there is no parking. As for marking a site with a view to the countryside! What about those

villagers who will lose their view of the countryside. The Barningham Neighbourhood Plan should be wary of promoting so many potential sites. This will only encourage Suffolk County Council to see the village as happy for large scale expansion which it most surely is not. The Parish Council should put greater effort into finding ways of purchasing and developing small areas of land for woodland and nature areas for the school and future generations. Aggie's Piece is not enough. Planting trees for the environment and a Forest School facility for the village children and whole community to enjoy would better use of small areas of land. Yes we need to find answers to housing problems but lets be careful not to offer up our village so openly and remember we are surrounded by agricultural land needed to feed the growing population. The countryside is the reason most people live here and the Parish Council should take more time reflecting upon that.

The existing community building is dated and in wrong location hence I would support a new one.

Where is the requirement of 37 homes stated? This is only at consultation stage by the Local Council (Local Plan) so I find it strange that actual numbers are being quoted. Again this is contrary to that stated in the Virtual consultation video that can be viewed at West Suffolk. There are anomalies in the documentation which are misleading – Option 4 is shown as a large area (along the lines of previous development suggested by Pigeon Developments) yet the detailed map is only part of that area. The scales are inconsistent and therefore do not offer a fair reflection. Option 5 no vehicle access to A143 – incorrect. The criteria selected are misleading – all developments will have an impact on the village – for example all will join the B111 at some point, probably where the current shop is, so to use an expression “avoiding the village” is wrong. Walking time (max 5 minutes?) is irrelevant and a red herring.

I do feel the Parish Council maybe have a conflict of interest on this report!

Our household is not in agreement. The alternative point of view is Q1. Housing and community building Q2. Housing and land on Site 1.

Site 1 would increase traffic through the village centre and past school and currently used essential amenities. Also would increase traffic through the difficult crossroads junction.

Site 1 should not be considered as this has been in flood all winter and last winter too. It also has a natural woodland, which would be criminal to lose.

To get to plot 1 and 4 would mean more traffic using Hepworth Road and Church Road which aren't appropriate for heavy traffic. The centre of the Barningham by the shop gets very busy and the junction isn't great.

Site 1 shouldn't be used for development as the roads around site are narrow and are heavily used by machinery, and this would also involve more vehicles going through the village past the church/pub/school/shop where the road is even tighter especially with larger vehicles. Also the wooded area is a haven for wildlife like deer/foxes/buzzards/kites/kestrels/owls (which are seen daily). The field and wooded

area is often flooded which floods across the road into Aggie's Piece which makes Aggie's Piece inaccessible.

Concerned about volume of traffic at Spar shop junction and down past if Site 1 was put forward. Continuous flooding & amount of wildlife on the site & that all traffic would have to go through Sandy Lane & village. Unsafe at times with current amount of traffic & issues with speeding cars – has been reported.

Site 1, This would be unsuitable because of the regular flooding and access not safe due to more traffic coming out on Pound Corner.

Area 1 should not be considered. Recent and obvious significant flooding located in a valley. Almost all traffic would have to drive to village centre, past Primary School (chaos now) in the mornings and afternoons, a pub. & a church with very limited parking and access to B111 by the shop on a very busy crossroads. Shop parking can be chaotic & dangerous now.

Site 1 – We feel is unsuitable for the following reasons: the site is on a flood plain and flooded several times this year and previous years; vehicle access. Unsuitable for the main road. Large site would mean too much traffic; the infrastructure is not viable; nature conservation has not been taken into account. And severe loss of trees.

Site 1 would interfere with the most wildlife and is apt to flood in its bottom areas.

Site 1 floods every year, building would make flooding worse.

No to Site 1: currently owls, heron, roe deer visit as it is adjacent to Longmeadow Pond (Moat Plantation) a quiet spot, unspoiled by light pollution. Here too are natural reed beds, agricultural land.

Sites 1 & 2 would create a sprawling village & neither has good access for cars.

We've chosen 2: ease of access to sewers and ease of access to main road and least impact on village.

We feel plot 2 and 5 would be more suited for housing due to being on the main road.

Site 2, 3 & 5 offer greater access directly to the B111 which is a more suitable road.

[5 &] 2 if building must take place are surely the most sensible options.

Site 2 offers ample space, on outskirts of the village, accessible by locals. The entrance would avoid the busy shop junction.

Site 2 or 4 preference for space + community building.

Site 2 elongates the village and would create more traffic through centre. Would require increased pedestrian traffic along the busy B111 and is a longer walk from school and shop etc.

No to Site 2, seems wrong to build on agricultural land, remember we are an agricultural county! Seems a big field to destroy.

Sites 1 & 2 would create a sprawling village & neither has good access for cars.

Site 2, 3 & 5 offer greater access directly to the B111 which is a more suitable road.

To eliminate as much traffic as possible going through the village we have chosen sites 3 & 5.

Site 3 offers wider road, good visibility... This site gives continuity to the housing that currently exists.

If we do have to have further building development of the scale suggested in the survey I have shown in my response that I think Site 3 and part of 4 to be slightly better options. Here there would be easier access – no requirement to add footpaths or compulsorily purchase front gardens, move telegraph posts or to mess with road layout. It would also be adjacent to our other new development – so water electricity/services should be easy to install with minimal disruption. This is a well-drained, dry area for building on.

Sites 3 & 5 seem too small for 30+ houses.

Site 3 would also create more traffic through village centre crossroads and increase pedestrian traffic along busy B111 road.

Area 3 would impact regularly used & popular footpaths, full of nature, popular with dog walkers & families. This end of the village has also lost some of its countryside recently to the Lingwood Close build & unfair to add more.

If we do have to have further building development of the scale suggested in the survey I have shown in my response that I think Site 3 and part of 4 to be slightly better options. Here there would be easier access – no requirement to add footpaths or compulsorily purchase front gardens, move telegraph posts or to mess with road layout. It would also be adjacent to our other new development – so water electricity/services should be easy to install with minimal disruption. This is a well-drained, dry area for building on.

Site 2 or 4 preference for space + community building.

Sites 4 & 5 keep the village located around the existing centre.

We feel Site 4 not suitable as traffic would use Hepworth Road staggered junction near shop that has poor visibility.

To get to plot 1 and 4 would mean more traffic using Hepworth Road and Church Road which aren't appropriate for heavy traffic. The centre of the Barningham by the shop gets very busy and the junction isn't great.

Access to Site 4 is not ideal for cars.

I believe that housing should be built on Site 5 as it already meets 4 out of the 5 criteria. Whilst I understand that housing must be built, it seems a terrible shame that our beautiful village may be overrun with building works. As it stands at the moment we have a wonderful school, a local pub and a well-stocked convenience store. The village hall could do with an upgrade and possibly a new site as it is not really well

placed for a busy event due to lack of car parking but I would not like to choose a bigger site if it meant more housing, just for a new village hall.

We feel plot 2 and 5 would be more suited for housing due to being on the main road.

We have chosen Site 5 because we believe this will have the least impact traffic wise, as they will be direct onto the B111, but still very much in the village.

Site 2, 3 & 5 offer greater access directly to the B111 which is a more suitable road.

5 [& 2] if building must take place are surely the most sensible options.

To eliminate as much traffic as possible going through the village we have chosen sites 3 & 5.

Site 5 is the best option for all the reasons indicated. The junction at the shop is congested and dangerous at many times of the day, all other sites would increase traffic at this bottleneck.

If we are looking for 34 homes with two-car families, that is 68 more cars potentially. Site 5 offers the best suitability with this in mind – taking traffic to the A143 without clogging the village.

Sites 4 & 5 keep the village located around the existing centre.

Site 5 will have the least impact on thoroughfare traffic.

If we do have to have further building development of the scale suggested in the survey I have shown in my response that I think Site 5 to be least suitable. Access would be an issue and if a suitable footpath were installed to access the site on Bardwell Road, as suggested in the survey, the associated costs would be ridiculous – requiring the compulsory purchase of front gardens along the road, re-siting telegraph and electricity poles etc. Vehicular access at the other side of the site onto the B111 will require major reworking of the road and perhaps installation of a roundabout on an already busy stretch of road with access potentially located on a blind bend. Again, compulsory purchase of gardens/field would be necessary for this work to accommodate the extra traffic joining the B111. Site 5 has poor drainage and it floods. It is also right next to a designated heritage asset which makes it unsuitable.

Sites 3 & 5 seem too small for 30+ houses.

Site 1... the wooded area is a haven for wildlife like deer/foxes/buzzards/kites/kestrels/owls (which are seen daily).

Site 1... amount of wildlife on the site.

Site 1... It also has a natural woodland, which would be criminal to lose.

Site 1 – We feel is unsuitable for the following reasons: nature conservation has not been taken into account. And severe loss of trees.

Site 1 would interfere with the most wildlife.

No to Site 1: currently owls, heron, roe deer visit as it is adjacent to Longmeadow Pond (Moat Plantation) a quiet spot, unspoiled by light pollution. Here too are natural reed beds.

Site 1 would increase traffic through the village centre and past school and currently used essential amenities. Also would increase traffic through the difficult crossroads junction.

Site 2 elongates the village and would create more traffic through centre.

Site 3 would also create more traffic through village centre crossroads

A pedestrian crossing needs to be considered on Church Road by school and B111 near shop so it is safer to cross.

Concerned about volume of traffic at Spar shop junction and down past if Site 1 was put forward. Concerned...that all traffic would have to go through Sandy Lane & village. Unsafe at times with current amount of traffic & issues with speeding cars – has been reported.

Site 1 shouldn't be used for development as the roads around site are narrow and are heavily used by agricultural machinery, and this would also involve more vehicles going through the village past the church/pub/school/shop where the road is even tighter especially with larger vehicles.

Concerned about volume of traffic at Spar shop junction and down past if Site 1 was put forward.

Site 1, This would be unsuitable because of the... access not safe due to more traffic coming out on Pound Corner.

Areas 3 & 4 but would surely require new access to B111. To use the road to Hepworth would surely be ludicrous. An overused crossroads now and B111 is on a bend with limited views.

Area 1 should not be considered. Almost all traffic would have to drive to village centre, past Primary School (chaos now) in the mornings and afternoons, a pub. & a church with very limited parking and access to B111 by the shop on a very busy crossroads. Shop parking can be chaotic & dangerous now.

Site 1 – We feel is unsuitable for the following reasons: vehicle access. Unsuitable for the main road. Large site would mean too much traffic.

Any new builds need direct access onto B111 rather than causing more traffic in the village.

To eliminate as much traffic as possible going through the village we have chosen sites 3 & 5.

Site 5 is the best option...The junction at the shop is congested and dangerous at many times of the day, all other sites would increase traffic at this bottleneck.

Site 3 offers wider road, good visibility and pavement could be extended to allow walking to school, shop, church. A pedestrian crossing could be added to allow safer crossing – would act as measure to slow traffic through.

Traffic - already bad due to increased building in Barningham and in nearby Stanton and Bardwell. The issue will only get worse with further development. An additional 34 houses could potentially mean a further 50-60 cars.

I believe the fundamental driver should be safe access to the main road. We suffer from a dangerous junction between Hepworth Road and the B111 – we need to avoid adding vehicles to Hepworth Road which would add to the issues here. During school times this is especially so. If we are looking for 34 homes with two-car families, that is 68 more cars potentially. Site 5 offers the best suitability with this in mind – taking traffic to the A143 without clogging the village.

Site 5 will have the least impact on thoroughfare traffic. The crossroads next to the shop are hard to pull out of safely at the best of times.

We have concerns about the infrastructure of where we are. There are often problems with vehicles by the shop at peak times. 34 homes could potentially have 2/3 cars per household. We personally feel that our village is fine the way it is, and would prefer no more houses were being built.

I am not content for further housing in Barningham.

Received late. Outline of process written, then the following comments:

1. The first question to all villagers in this survey should address the issue of whether or not there should be further development within Barningham. This survey delivers the issue of development as a “done deal”.
2. There is no information regarding how the short list of potential locations was selected.
3. There are a number of other factors which will be impacted upon with any further development in the village which have not been considered: a) School at full capacity – the village school is filled to capacity – if we must have further development perhaps consider closing Barningham Primary and sending all primary school children to the much larger primary school facility in Stanton. Perhaps convert the school into either a Drs surgery or housing. b) Village hall – in 2017, there was talk of a new village hall being built if further housing were to be built in the village. If this is still part of the plan – perhaps demolish the outdated substandard affordable housing surrounding the current village hall, demolish the village hall and build much better, more suitable properties like the new ones on the left hand side of the road as you approach the village hall. Then consider building a new village hall on Plot 3 with better parking than at the current location. c) Registration with a GP – Planning permission to extend Stanton Surgery has been denied. I worth and Stanton surgeries are operating at full capacity. Where are additional households to register with a Dr? d) Traffic - already bad due to increased building in Barningham and in nearby Stanton and Bardwell. The issue will only get worse with further development. An additional 34 houses could potentially mean a further 50-60 cars.

e) Congestion – particularly at school pick up and drop off times – there is no parking for parents. They park along a substantial length of Bardwell Road on the school side of the road. It causes problems for residents attempting to enter and exit their own properties safely in their cars or on foot. To build a footpath in Bardwell Road to access village centre would actually exacerbate congestion and road safety issues.

f) Shop – The shop is very popular and constantly busy -the area around it is already very busy with traffic and access is frequently hindered by. Volume of traffic. Additional housing with its additional cars will exacerbate this problem.

g) Type of housing – be careful with increasing the amount of social housing or increasing the number. Of bungalows for the elderly – there are few jobs in the area and a reliance on cars; the bus service is v poor. If. The PC do increase social housing they must improve the bus service accordingly.

4. Alternatives – There are very strong alternatives to building in Barningham which is classed as a local services centre. I would argue that. The local amenities are at saturation already: a) post-COVID. – The town will require redevelopment and rethinking.. it would be sensible to increase housing in Bury St Edmunds town – there are now even more vacant properties which could be. Converted into housing. These would be close to train and bus services and would reduce reliance on commuting to Bury for those working in Bury itself. b) Perhaps develop smaller villages closer to Bury which have a good bus service into town c) Improve the facilities in those villages where they are lacking amenities and a decent bus service. And in fill a few houses in each only. d) Before building more houses – ensure that the large developments in and around Bury. – specifically Thurston, Morton. Hall, and Marham Park – have houses which are actually being. Purchased and occupied.. I understand that building of Marham Park has been scaled down due to lack of demand. These alternatives are all discussed in the West Suffolk Local Plan Issues and Options Part 1 – and should be pushed by the PC as arguments against further development in Barningham.

5. If we do have to have further building development of the scale suggested in the survey I have shown in my response that I think Site 5 to be least suitable and Site 3 and part of 4 to be slightly better options. Here there would be easier access – no requirement to add footpaths or compulsorily purchase front gardens, move telegraph posts or to mess with road layout. It would also be adjacent to our other new development – so water electricity/services should be easy to install with minimal disruption. This is a well-drained, dry area for building on. The PC should fight against the proposal for 34 houses more in the village of Barningham.

The village seems to be lacking in community space/amenities. Thanks for all your hard work on this project 😊

We think that Barningham need to be brought up to the twentieth century and a new village hall/community centre we think is a must as all other villages around us have good halls and it could be good income for the village.

Thank you for all the effort on this.

Happy to see new development, however keen that council instruct development to be sustainably built – grey water systems, sustainable building materials, future proof for weather changes etc. We would love to see a development that has large gardens and appreciates the well-being of inhabitants and the village at large. We'd also like to see tree planting schemes built into development or as part of the community 'out building' rather than a community indoor space. We'd like to see unique designs of each house or cluster so it does not look like a boring non-specific estate 'plonked' down.

Site 1... Continuous flooding

Site 1 should not be considered as this has been in flood all winter and last winter too.

Site 1... The field and wooded area is often flooded which floods across the road into Aggie's Piece which makes Aggie's Piece inaccessible.

Site 1, This would be unsuitable because of the regular flooding

Area 1 should not be considered. Recent and obvious significant flooding located in a valley.

Site 1 – We feel is unsuitable for the following reasons: the site is on a flood plain and flooded several times this year and previous years.

Site 1... is apt to flood in its bottom areas.

Site 1 floods every year, building would make flooding worse.

The criteria of pedestrian access to Aggie's Piece is irrelevant as the whole village has access to it via the road!

Not only are the roads not appropriate we feel the footpaths need to be considered for many of the plots. They are not wide enough when passing someone and if we have more housing this means more traffic on the road.

We desperately need a new village hall, as the one we have is damp and needs updating badly, also we would need something for children play area, skate board etc. as the ones we have also need updating. We also need lots more council properties not just 2 or 4. Also making sure there is enough extra spaces for car parks, as most people have more than 1 car.

Our household is not in agreement. The alternative point of view is Q1. Housing and community building Q2. Housing and land on Site 1.

I think 34 houses is acceptable for the size of our village but no more due to the lack of amenities.

Thank you for organising this consultation.

Barningham is a small village which is one of the reasons we moved here. The infrastructure would need to be improved if more houses are built. Is there enough room at the school for more children? The drains & sewers in Barningham block

easily. With a previous build of houses we had massive problems with the sewers, causing blockage & grit in our water systems. A large estate would ruin the feel of the village, which is a nice & caring community, as well as put a strain on the infrastructure. Any new builds need direct access onto B111 rather than causing more traffic in the village.

Our only concern is what will be done about the sewage. Will another development put even more pressure on the existing system and if so what will be done about it?

Instead of a community building maybe a doctors' surgery should be considered, Stanton doctors are full & more housing means more people. Site 3 keeps the village within the housing boundary.

Let's put something back! Instead of placing emphasis all onto Aggie's Piece, let's create another wildlife area at land adjacent to Site 3. With more discussion on mindfulness and wellbeing this would be good opportunity. Ask all residents if they would participate in funding purchase of trees, hedging so we give nature a chance for generations to enjoy seating, bird feeders etc. Only would agree to community building if there was a genuine plan, programme of activities worthy of such cost. What about tennis courts instead?

No to Site 5, seems 'out' of village if it's where I think. In years beyond 2040, Site 4 possibly – but do not make this village another Thurston or Great Barton or Stanton. With Site 3 – would this allow 34 houses?

As a family with young children we value road safety, community building & retaining our green spaces & walks as priorities.

Neighbouring villages have reasonable community buildings which are under utilised so I see no reason to build another one at this time.

Consideration needs to be taken into account for the village infrastructure. How is the village going to cope with the additional houses? Will there be additional amenities for the village? ie a bigger shop with parking?

Our household of four. Are in agreement with what we have noted.

With all these new homes, how many more cars – 30 - 60? Where is the parking, it's awful now! Also new. School? Surgery? Also paths & roads need repairing! Think again!

Survey bias – I feel very strongly that the major failing in this survey is the way the survey is so very biased towards Site 5 as the best option. Clearly the PC favour this site as the survey appears to suggest, with its tick box criteria that this is the best site. I believe Site 5 to be the least suitable of the options presented. The survey also wrongly assumes that all traffic is heading towards Bury St Edmunds. For vehicles to go to Thetford they would have to go past the shop; and already congested crunch point in the village.

The PC should reconsider the validity of this rather strange and heavily biased survey. The results will be artificially skewed towards Site 5. A) due to the biased tick box criteria, b) due to numbers of families along Bardwell Road being very low vs

number of families responding against development in the sites nearest to their own houses (which have more respondents per road).

Site 1 Good pedestrian access via Church Road footpath and good vehicle access for Thetford bound traffic. Large enough for future development.

Site 1 would not detract from the beauty of the village.

Subject to flooding. Not a good area.

Site 2 Good pedestrian access to Centre via existing footpaths. Good access for Harling/Diss bound traffic.

Site 2 will cause the least disruption to residents.

My choice is because of its closeness to the main road. One site only because building will then be in one area and not restrict traffic flow in two places or more. Safety of new builds is important.

37 homes are not a lot, should there be a need to increase this number there is room on the land next to site 2.

Site 3 Good alternative to 4. Good pedestrian access to centre and Aggies via Sandy Lane. Maybe not large enough for Hall and parking.

I think two sites would be less obtrusive (3 & 5). I have chosen these two sites because my thinking is there would probably be children in the new households and both these sites are within walking distance to the village school.

Site 4 Good pedestrian access to centre and Aggies via Millfield and Hepworth with little road walking. Sufficient land for hall and parking

Site 4 contains an area that has been left fallow since construction of the Lingwood estate. This has become habitat to ground nesting birds and hedgehogs which would be adversely affected by development of this site. Deer are frequently seen browsing in this area too.

Poor access to B1111 and A143. Dangerous junction at post office.

Site 5 Least traffic through village with site 5

Essential to consider drainage/sewerage impacts. Often affected down Church Road. If on one site only – 5.

I think two sites would be less obtrusive (3 & 5). I have chosen these two sites because my thinking is there would probably be children in the new households and both these sites are within walking distance to the village school

I feel that site 5 is the only one which could be considered for additional housing. The road network within the village already struggles with the volume of cars. There are several roads in and out of the village where two cars or a car and a lorry struggle to pass freely, without breaching the verge.

Least traffic through village with site 5

The proposed entrance to Site 5 is actually on a dangerous bend in the road. Even if the 30 mph limit is extended towards Stanton this would create a hazard. There are already too many speeding drivers who ignore the limit. This would be an accident waiting to happen.

Site 5 apparently has access to the A143 whereas none of the others do! Really? I don't think there is any significant difference in journey times, then we all join the traffic jam from bottom of George Hill to Bury St Edmunds.

Site 5 would have real problems getting onto the B1111 due to bends blocking visibility. Good luck to those who wish to walk to the shop or pub due to speeding cars down narrow road and flooding.

Very poor safe pedestrian access anywhere and possibly too small for Hall and parking.

Site 4 contains an area that has been left fallow since construction of the Lingwood estate. This has become habitat to ground nesting birds and hedgehogs which would be adversely affected by development of this site. Deer are frequently seen browsing in this area too.

The vehicle access to roads criteria could have been expanded to destinations as it seems to suggest that in many cases the access to the two major roads has to be through the centre which is not always the case.

Need to avoid any further traffic joining B1111 at shop crossroads, any increase in traffic should join B1111 directly.

The proposed entrance to Site 5 is actually on a dangerous bend in the road. Even if the 30 mph limit is extended towards Stanton this would create a hazard. There are already too many speeding drivers who ignore the limit. This would be an accident waiting to happen.

Site 5 apparently has access to the A143 whereas none of the others do! Really? I don't think there is any significant difference in journey times, then we all join the traffic jam from bottom of George Hill to Bury St Edmunds.

Site 5 would have real problems getting onto the B1111 due to bends blocking visibility. Good luck to those who wish to walk to the shop or pub due to speeding cars down narrow road and flooding.

I feel that site 5 is the only one which could be considered for additional housing. The road network within the village already struggles with the volume of cars. There are several roads in and out of the village where two cars or a car and a lorry struggle to pass freely, without breaching the verge.

Least traffic through village with site 5

The word "WANT" is not really appropriate when most of the village occupants would not require any housing added to Barningham at all.

NONE OF THIS.

Our household would like development that provides land for a new hall and parking so that the existing hall land could be redeveloped for low cost housing.

Current village hall is underused. Another building will not create a sense of community.

I feel that with this number of houses that it should be added that the village hall is made bigger, maybe with a community centre attached.

Our household would like development that provides land for a new hall and parking so that the existing hall land could be redeveloped for low cost housing

Hopefully some will be affordable for first time buyers and some for rent that youngsters can afford.

Essential to consider drainage/sewerage impacts. Often affected down Church Road. Larger site may encourage far larger development compounding access and drainage problems.

Adequate drainage and sewerage required.

I really hope drainage is on your agenda. I am the last house on the water and drainage system and it has caused me problems for the last 16 years I have lived here.

I really don't understand why Aggies piece is such a priority, there's no path to there now, why is it such a criteria? Plus it has been flooded most of the winter, will that be addressed too?

Site 1 - Subject to flooding. Not a good area.

I feel with all this additional housing, the shop will be more important for the village and attract more footfall. However, this in itself attracts a risk of more bad parking out of the front of the store and I feel parking at the front of the shop must be stopped. You should never turn into a junction on the wrong side of the road! Which has to happen. With people parking in front of the shop.

Should not extend village any further from centre.

We all know that Plot 4 is the designated building site. The road at the north west of the plot was always meant to be an access and the "view out to countryside" Ha Ha Ha is access to the future building project, yet to come.

Your site plan shows no existence of Drouts Lane. Seems a very misleading plan.

An additional 34 houses would require no need for additional community infrastructure, this is simply a way of the council bribing the parish. If additional community infrastructure is built this will be at the initial cost of more houses and encourage future development.

I myself am a property developer and live here as it's a lovely rural location. I don't wish to move but if plans go ahead I will happily demolish my current property and obtain planning easily for 4 properties on my plot. These plans could ruin the village and if the parish decided to make the quick buck then as will a lot of the existing residents. Thus ruining this beautiful village forever.

Pavement access to extend to Hopton Road pavement.

Any housing development has to be supported with improvements to infrastructure.

I totally understand that there is a need for more housing. Will the village building line be moved? Will there be a new village building line to accommodate all of the sites of development? My home backs onto site 2. My home will be devalued by development. Will the developers give us any insight into what is built there?

WAIT AND SEE

Other issues for future consideration are emergency access, street lighting and footpaths entering and leaving the new development.

I would like to see a "proper" chemist or even better medical centre including Chiropodist. I also think a piece of the current playing field should be made into a proper car park for the school. Mill Road is dreadful for inconsiderate parking when collecting children.

An excellent document – well produced.

NO INTEREST. I AM 80!

Build on all

PS. Thankyou for your hard work to produce all this information and involve everyone.