

Why on earth would the parish council think that Barrow residents would want to see such excessive development? One possible answer is that they have been advised by Turley.

The preferred location for any new housing would be near the school, towards the A14 so that traffic through the village is kept to a minimum. That site would seem ideally suited to allow expansion of the school and improve traffic safety problems at school drop off and pick up times. In other words, ideally north of the village NOT south as proposed by the neighbourhood plan.

Locating such a large site to the south of the village will mean that much of the traffic will come through the village, past the school to or from the A14. This is a bad idea.

At least the traffic from Bury Road will not be so bad because the site is much smaller, some traffic will naturally go down Bury Road (which is rarely busy) to Bury and there are 2 bus stops there.

I also see that the proposed site is close to Wilsummer Wood. I believe this is a protected habitat and so it seems a bad idea to build so close by. Bury Road is much more distant and I am not aware that there would be any impact on protected habitats. I note that Bloor Homes are planning a wetland nature area which seems like a very positive idea.

The use of Turley as consultants demonstrates poor judgement by the parish council. I suggest that Turley have deliberately presented a long winded and overly complicated document on the basis of 'bullsh\*t baffles brains'. It will be beyond many of the old folk to read and understand a 100 page document written in such an unhelpful fashion. If Pigeon are a major client then common sense should tell the parish council that Turley will be influenced by commercial pressure. One aspect of this would be to discourage feedback. Parish funds should only have been spent on a wholly independent consultant.

In conclusion, I strongly disagree with the neighbourhood plan. It is plainly a bad plan, poorly publicised, poorly presented and biased towards the landowners not the parish.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

17 October 2023

### Neighbourhood Plan

I wish to object strongly to the Neighbourhood Plan.

I had previously felt that development in the southern part of the village would be most preferable, but I am persuaded by the very thorough and professional reports from Aecom that this is not as sustainable as development in other, more central parts of the village.

I cannot see a good reason why the PC has ignored Aecom's reports and chosen a less sustainable site – it simply does not make sense.

I am informed that if the Barrow Hill site is developed, the landowners will provide a new sports field at Barrow Hill. If this is the case, why is it not included in the Neighbourhood Plan? How will they play football on a hill? Besides, I do not think we need a new sports field – we have one already and it is not used that often. It would be better to improve the sports field and village hall that we have rather than using more land to build a new one.

The Barrow Hill site will cause too much traffic through the village.

We do not need any more offices or industrial units. I believe there is already planning permission for an industrial park north of the school. Since this would be close to the A14 this is a sensible location, rather than having lorries and HGVs traffic pass through the village and past the school where there would be an obvious safety hazard.

I think it's a cruel idea to put old people's homes in such remote locations. It would more sensible to locate old people's homes near the centre of larger villages or towns where the elderly are less isolated and could enjoy easy access to shops etc.

The site is not served by public transport.

The site would be highly visible from a surprisingly long distance. I was near Chevington recently and the site is visible from there, spoiling a beautiful view. I think this may be missing from Aecom's environmental report because the lines of sight are not obvious.

I have seen information from Bloor Homes regarding their site at Bury Road and I think this is a much better site because it is smaller and closer to shops etc. in the centre of Barrow. It is also close to the A14 and closer to public transport.

The division between Barrow and Burthorpe is illusory. One has only to walk along Bury Road to see that there is already no discernible difference or gap between Burthorpe and Barrow. Besides, the Bury Road site is to have an open area along most of its boundary with Bury Road which means that any threat of coalescence is negated.

The Denham Lane site is only for about 20 houses and the location would not impact Denham (which I believe is classed as countryside rather than a settlement).

The PC's inexplicable decisions may have something to do with the appointment of Turley who I understand work for the landowners of the site at Barrow Hill. This seems highly irregular since they are unlikely to offer wholly independent advice to the PC.



17 October 2023

### Neighbourhood Plan

I wish to object strongly to the Neighbourhood Plan.

I had previously felt that development in the southern part of the village would be most preferable, but I am persuaded by the very thorough and professional reports from Aecom that this is not as sustainable as development in other, more central parts of the village.

I cannot see a good reason why the PC has ignored Aecom's reports and chosen a less sustainable site – it simply does not make sense.

I am informed that if the Barrow Hill site is developed, the landowners will provide a new sports field at Barrow Hill. If this is the case, why is it not included in the Neighbourhood Plan? How will they play football on a hill? Besides, I do not think we need a new sports field – we have one already and it is not used that often. It would be better to improve the sports field and village hall that we have rather than using more land to build a new one.

The Barrow Hill site will cause too much traffic through the village.

We do not need any more offices or industrial units. I believe there is already planning permission for an industrial park north of the school. Since this would be close to the A14 this is a sensible location, rather than having lorries and HGVs traffic pass through the village and past the school where there would be an obvious safety hazard.

I think it's a cruel idea to put old people's homes in such remote locations. It would more sensible to locate old people's homes near the centre of larger villages or towns where the elderly are less isolated and could enjoy easy access to shops etc.

The site is not served by public transport.

The site would be highly visible from a surprisingly long distance. I was near Chevington recently and the site is visible from there, spoiling a beautiful view. I think this may be missing from Aecom's environmental report because the lines of sight are not obvious.

I have seen information from Bloor Homes regarding their site at Bury Road and I think this is a much better site because it is smaller and closer to shops etc. in the centre of Barrow. It is also close to the A14 and closer to public transport.

The division between Barrow and Burthorpe is illusory. One has only to walk along Bury Road to see that there is already no discernible difference or gap between Burthorpe and Barrow. Besides, the Bury Road site is to have an open area along most of its boundary with Bury Road which means that any threat of coalescence is negated.

The Denham Lane site is only for about 20 houses and the location would not impact Denham (which I believe is classed as countryside rather than a settlement).

The PC's inexplicable decisions may have something to do with the appointment of Turley who I understand work for the landowners of the site at Barrow Hill. This seems highly irregular since they are unlikely to offer wholly independent advice to the PC.



17 October 2023

### Neighbourhood Plan

I wish to object strongly to the Neighbourhood Plan.

I had previously felt that development in the southern part of the village would be most preferable, but I am persuaded by the very thorough and professional reports from Aecom that this is not as sustainable as development in other, more central parts of the village.

I cannot see a good reason why the PC has ignored Aecom's reports and chosen a less sustainable site – it simply does not make sense.

I am informed that if the Barrow Hill site is developed, the landowners will provide a new sports field at Barrow Hill. If this is the case, why is it not included in the Neighbourhood Plan? How will they play football on a hill? Besides, I do not think we need a new sports field – we have one already and it is not used that often. It would be better to improve the sports field and village hall that we have rather than using more land to build a new one.

The Barrow Hill site will cause too much traffic through the village.

We do not need any more offices or industrial units. I believe there is already planning permission for an industrial park north of the school. Since this would be close to the A14 this is a sensible location, rather than having lorries and HGVs traffic pass through the village and past the school where there would be an obvious safety hazard.

I think it's a cruel idea to put old people's homes in such remote locations. It would more sensible to locate old people's homes near the centre of larger villages or towns where the elderly are less isolated and could enjoy easy access to shops etc.

The site is not served by public transport.

The site would be highly visible from a surprisingly long distance. I was near Chevington recently and the site is visible from there, spoiling a beautiful view. I think this may be missing from Aecom's environmental report because the lines of sight are not obvious.

I have seen information from Bloor Homes regarding their site at Bury Road and I think this is a much better site because it is smaller and closer to shops etc. in the centre of Barrow. It is also close to the A14 and closer to public transport.

The division between Barrow and Burthorpe is illusory. One has only to walk along Bury Road to see that there is already no discernible difference or gap between Burthorpe and Barrow. Besides, the Bury Road site is to have an open area along most of its boundary with Bury Road which means that any threat of coalescence is negated.

The Denham Lane site is only for about 20 houses and the location would not impact Denham (which I believe is classed as countryside rather than a settlement).

The PC's inexplicable decisions may have something to do with the appointment of Turley who I understand work for the landowners of the site at Barrow Hill. This seems highly irregular since they are unlikely to offer wholly independent advice to the PC.





## Neighbourhood plan

1 message

17 October 2023 at 20:31



Dear Sir or Madam

I write to express my strong objection to the Neighbourhood Plan due to a number of factors:

The Plan is not supported by the evidence but rather contradicts it.

The proposed site is excessively large because it could fit more than twice the housing requirement of 170 houses. 97% of respondents in the parish questionnaire wished to protect the natural environment & green spaces around Barrow. The preferred site would build on an unnecessarily large greenfield site.

The parish questionnaire shows that 83% of respondents wished to see a minimum amount of development. However, if there had to be development, 55% of respondents chose the north west quadrant of the parish, nearer the main transport links so as to minimise traffic through the village. The proposed site is in the south east quadrant of the village – diametrically opposite and furthest away from the transport links. Given there are no bus stops in the south east quadrant, this will increase traffic through the village.

The Plan also proposes further office/industrial development. 81% of respondents to the parish questionnaire thought that Barrow-cum-Denham had sufficient business premises. Additional business premises are unnecessary given the planning allocation for Barrow Business Park and planning permissions for large offices at Barrow Hall and Green Farm, Barrow Hill. Moreover, the rise in home working has reduced demand for office development.

Policy BCD7 is alarming as it would allow the site to be used solely for housing, which would equate to 400+ houses.

The consultation states that the preferred site ‘has been carefully selected on the basis of an independent, comparative site analysis’. This is highly misleading as the expert report actually states that other sites are more suitable.

The expert report on site assessment found that the Denham Lane site was highly suitable:- “Development of the site therefore has potential to round off the settlement to the west while providing a defensible boundary to further risk of coalescence.” It is a small site and its elongated shape would not alter Barrow’s settlement boundary materially. The PC’s decision to reject this site on grounds of coalescence is irrational.

The expert environmental report shows that the Denham Lane and Bury Road sites are more suitable than the proposed site. The PC’s decision to reject the Bury Road site on grounds of coalescence is irrational because its site plan shows its north east portion as an open/green area. This negates any risk of coalescence. Notably, the Bury Road site has good public transport links given the bus stops along Bury Road at Sharpe’s Hill & Papeley Meadow (which have been omitted from the Plan’s map of amenities on page 26).

A convincing argument as to why the PC has disregarded expert advice and the parish questionnaire is absent from the Plan.

The owners of the preferred site used Turley consultants to promote their land to West Suffolk Council in the emerging Local Plan. The PC’s decision to use public money for the same consultants to write the Neighbourhood Plan is regrettable. On a matter such as this, independence is important and perception of independence even more so.

Kind regards





# Barrow Neighbourhood Plan

1 message

17 October 2023 at 08:53



Dear Parish Council,

Please accept this email as a strong objection to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Plan is not supported by the evidence but rather contradicts it.

The proposed site is excessively large because it could fit more than twice the housing requirement of 170 houses. 97% of respondents in the parish questionnaire wished to protect the natural environment & green spaces around Barrow. The preferred site would build on an unnecessarily large greenfield site.

The parish questionnaire shows that 83% of respondents wished to see a minimum amount of development. However, if there had to be development, 55% of respondents chose the north west quadrant of the parish, nearer the main transport links so as to minimise traffic through the village. The proposed site is in the south east quadrant of the village – diametrically opposite and furthest away from the transport links. Given there are no bus stops in the south east quadrant, this will increase traffic through the village.

The Plan also proposes further office/industrial development. 81% of respondents to the parish questionnaire thought that Barrow-cum-Denham had sufficient business premises. Additional business premises are unnecessary given the planning allocation for Barrow Business Park and planning permissions for large offices at Barrow Hall and Green Farm, Barrow Hill. Moreover, the rise in home working has reduced demand for office development.

Policy BCD7 is alarming as it would allow the site to be used solely for housing, which would equate to 400+ houses.

The consultation states that the preferred site 'has been carefully selected on the basis of an independent, comparative site analysis'. This is highly misleading as the expert report actually states that other sites are more suitable.

The expert report on site assessment found that the Denham Lane site was highly suitable:- "Development of the site therefore has potential to round off the settlement to the west while providing a defensible boundary to further risk of coalescence." It is a small site and its elongated shape would not alter Barrow's settlement boundary materially. The PC's decision to reject this site on grounds of coalescence is irrational.

The expert environmental report shows that the Denham Lane and Bury Road sites are more suitable than the proposed site. The PC's decision to reject the Bury Road site on grounds of coalescence is irrational because its site plan shows its north east portion as an open/green area. This negates any risk of coalescence. Notably, the Bury Road site has good public transport links given the bus stops along Bury Road at Sharpe's Hill & Papeley Meadow (which have been omitted from the Plan's map of amenities on page 26).

A convincing argument as to why the PC has disregarded expert advice and the parish questionnaire is absent from the Plan.

The owners of the preferred site used Turley consultants to promote their land to West Suffolk Council in the emerging Local Plan. The PC's decision to use public money for the same consultants to write the Neighbourhood Plan is regrettable. On a matter such as this, independence is important and perception of independence even more so.

Kind regards



### Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.

[REDACTED]

Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.

[REDACTED]

Barrow-cum-Denham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation

I strongly object to the neighbourhood plan because:-

The site is too big. The site could accommodate 400+ houses which is more than double Barrow's housing target of 170 houses.

Inclusion of a large employment area in to the neighbourhood plan does not make sense because:

- the parish council's questionnaire (question 16) shows that a large majority think that Barrow has sufficient business premises
- a site for Barrow Business Park has already been allocated under St. Edmundsbury's Rural Vision 2031
- planning permission has already been granted for offices at Barrow Hill (DC/18/0252/FUL) and Barrow Hall (DC/20/1396/FUL)
- office space is in over abundant supply due to the high levels of home working after COVID.

Inclusion of a care home in to the neighbourhood plan seems to have come out of nowhere. I cannot see any reference to discussion, analysis or planning of a care home in the parish council minutes. The parish council's questionnaire shows that only a small minority believe that another care home is necessary in Barrow. Putting a care home in a distant part of a rural village seems non-sensical. Surely a better location for a care home would be close to a town centre where residents and their visiting families or friends might have much better access to town centre amenities such as shops, cafes, cinema, hospitals, public transport etc.

The site will generate too much traffic through the village. The parish council's questionnaire shows that traffic in Barrow is an important issue for parishioners. Of the various possible sites, the preferred site's size & position (away from the A14, nearest train station & the school) mean that it will generate most traffic through the village. Unlike other sites, it is not served by a bus route. A natural consequence of the site's poor connection to the transport infrastructure is that it will also generate the most carbon dioxide.

The site is not as sustainable as other sites. Contrary to the misleading statement in the consultation information, the site is not considered as sustainable as the Denham Lane or Bury Road sites by government approved, independent planning experts. The logic for ignoring government approved, expert advice and choosing a less sustainable site is unclear, probably because there is none. The 5Ha of sporting/recreational facilities used by the landowners to entice the PC are notably absent from the Plan.

Site selection process was unfair. The parish council gave important data to one landowner (Councillor Jane Steer) and not to other landowners (see parish council minutes of Nov. 2021).

Denham Lane site was wrongly dismissed. The site is small and much of it adjoins Barrow's settlement boundary which means that it does not cause coalescence with Denham. The site was assessed as highly suitable by government approved, independent experts, AECOM.

The Bury Road site has not been properly assessed. Bury Road site plans show a large open area at the north east of the site, which means that it will not coalesce with Burthorpe. AECOM's

assessment of the historical impact of the site contains errors which, once corrected, will further boost the site's sustainability ranking over Barrow Hill. If you walk along Bury Road it is not obvious where Barrow ends and Burthorpe begins and so the issue of coalescence seems irrelevant.

The parish council have not fought for the parish's preferred location north of the village and have not made sufficient representation to West Suffolk Council regarding amending the settlement boundary.

Development at the neighbourhood plan site may be in addition to sites in West Suffolk's Local Plan. Parish council minutes show that West Suffolk Council have informed the parish council that this could be the case, but this information is excluded from the consultation. This approach is not transparent and may be explained by the author's lack of independence (see below).

The neighbourhood plan document has been written by consultants whose interests align with the landowners, not the parish. The parish council chose Turley's Cambridge Office who have done 30+ projects for one of the landowners who is also a developer. It is naïve to think that Turley will not be biased towards the commercial interests of a major client over the parish. The tone and content of the document demonstrates this e.g., Policy 7's loophole to convert employment areas to housing; missing bus stops on Bury Road from the map; the misleading way that demand for sports facilities has been written and not including the fact that the site might be in addition to whatever sites are chosen by West Suffolk Council.

Due process has not been followed with regards to declarations of councillors' interests; the handling of Neighbourhood Plan information; the site selection process – not agreeing policies before site selection; the use of personal preference rather than evidence in voting and the use of non-independent experts to write policies.

I do not wish my comments to be attributed to my name.



# Have Your Say

The questionnaire shows that most people want to see a **MINIMUM** amount of development, north of the village to minimise traffic through the village.

The plan proposes a site with more than twice the area needed for the housing requirement, south of the village causing lots of traffic through the village.

The site assessment report shows Denham Lane to be highly suitable and a useful step to prevent coalescence. The PC rejected the site on grounds of coalescence.

Barrow doesn't need any more offices because a business park near the school has already been given planning permission.

Contrary to claims made by Turley's consultation material, the independent report does NOT support the preferred site. It shows Bury Road & Denham Lane sites as more sustainable. The PC's decision to reject the Bury Road site because of coalescence is daft because it does not coalesce Burthorpe – the north east of the site is to be a nature area.

The Plan does literally the opposite to what the evidence says.

This is perhaps unsurprising when only 4 councillors voted to select this site – one of whom said that his choice was based on personal preference rather than evidence.

Using a landowner to take PC Meeting minutes where they have a declared interest, the selection of Turley (who act for the owners of the preferred site) and the low number of councillors voting on site selection, reflects badly on the PC. The Chairman & Vice-Chair should resign.

Your views are important to us and we invite you to have your say on the draft Barrow-Cum-Denham Neighbourhood Plan. Please use this form to provide your feedback if you are not able to submit feedback on the website nor attend the community planning day on Saturday, 16 September, and are instead viewing hard copy materials.

Q1: Having read the draft and associated documents, do you agree with the vision set out for Barrow-cum-Denham in the draft Neighbourhood Plan?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

.....  .....  .....  .....

Q1: Having read the draft Barrow-cum-Denham Neighbourhood Plan and associated documents, do you have any comments, feedback or questions to raise with us?

Comment Box *see attached*

Optional: if you would like your comments to be attributable to you, please leave your name below.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

16<sup>th</sup> October 2023

Dear Mrs. Chilton,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan. I think ecological matters have not been fully considered and so I must object strongly. It is perhaps understandable that the most important issue facing humanity is overlooked when there are so many procedural details that cloud modern decisions. Nevertheless, there appears to be some important factors which have not been considered.

I understand that Barrow must accept a target of 170 houses and this seems reasonable given the UK's housing crisis. It is, however, illogical for the Plan to allocate such a large site which could potentially fit many more houses. Not only does this unnecessarily destroy a greenfield site, it reduces the amount of highly productive agricultural land in the UK. The consequence would be to import the lost harvest from overseas thus increasing the carbon footprint of our food. The site is also more distant from the A14 and not served by any public transport. The result will be that this site will produce more CO<sub>2</sub> from traffic than others which are either better served by public transport or are closer to the main road network. This will be exacerbated with the inclusion of a care home since the effect will be that residents are either more isolated or they and visitors will need to travel by car. The site is also the closest site to Wilsummer Wood which is designated as a county wildlife site. Whilst buffer distances have been maintained, the site's large size and proximity to a wildlife site will have a deleterious effect on Barrow's wildlife.

The inclusion of an employment area in to the site is also illogical. Question 16 of the PC's questionnaire shows that 81% of parishioners felt that Barrow had sufficient business premises. Also, Barrow already has an underutilised employment area near the church; a recently allocated area for a business park near the school and I believe there is planning permission for commercial buildings at Barrow Hall and at Barrow Hill.

I was impressed by the thoroughness and professionalism of the reports by Aecom. The decision to ignore these - without any clear reason - and decide on a much larger site seems illogical. The Aecom report shows that the Barrow Road and Denham Lane sites are the most sustainable. I like the Bury Road site's use of a nature area which includes ponds as this will encourage Barrow's great crested newts. Also, the site is well served by public transport with a number of bus stops close by which are absent from the preferred site. The bus service in Barrow is poor but if more people were to use the bus, because of conveniently located bus stops, this would encourage a better service as it is more attractive for the bus companies.

I prefer the Bury Road site alone to meet the housing target. If not practical, then the Denham Lane site is more sustainable than the Neighbourhood Plan's site. I do not believe it would cause coalescence with Denham End as there is no settlement boundary for Denham.

Yours sincerely,

