

Issues & Options Consultation - Comments  
Layer de la Haye  
Saturday 14 February 2015

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Option 1A</b><br>Development to the East and West  |  | <b>Option 1B</b><br>Development to the East and West<br>(Including the Villages)  |  |
| <b>Option 2A</b><br>Development to the West           |  | <b>Option 2B</b><br>Development to the West<br>(including the Villages)           |  |
| <b>Option 3A</b><br>Development to the East and North |  | <b>Option 3B</b><br>Development to the East and North<br>(including the villages) |  |

General Comments:

Please see attached.

Comments about the proposed sites in Layer de la Haye:

Please see attached.

Name:

Susan & Roderick Clark

Phone Number or E mail:



We were both born in the village and over the years have seen many changes. The village has grown and we expect it to continue to grow; however, the scale of some of the development proposed is, we feel, just too much. The addition of possibly more than 100 homes would not necessarily bring benefit to the village. We say this because when we were children we had 3 shops, a Post Office, 2 Pubs and a garage, but even though the village is now much larger with many more residents, all we have left are the Pubs. Life has changed, of course, and we think 21<sup>st</sup> Century families are not so interested, or dependent, on the community; they commute to work and engage in leisure activities elsewhere, every journey is by car and the village is often no more than a convenient place to live. Our roads are already busy and there are issues with speeding on the main road through the village, with parking for the School and with wear and tear on roads simply not built for the volume of traffic which currently passes over them, let alone more. The addition of so many more properties would no doubt also put pressure on other infrastructure, which, like the roads, was probably not designed for the volume a large housing development would demand.

We are not opposed to some development as we obviously recognize that it is necessary, so have no problem with infill or small developments, but we feel any large scale building should happen in an area more suited to it, such as the areas proposed in the plans outlined in the "A" options on this form; for instance, Marks Tey has ready access to both road and rail links to the capital and beyond and would, in our opinion, be a better prospect for larger developments.

Another consideration is the village envelope, which we feel is very important. Should it need to be broken to accommodate any of the smaller developments proposed we feel careful consideration should be given to whether this would create a precedent. It was stated at the open meeting that planning law does not have precedents and if we understand that statement correctly, then it would mean that any application requiring a breach of the envelope would be considered on its own merits and could not be cited in any future request for such a breach. If this is the case, then we would have no objection to a breach of the envelope to allow sensitive and considerate development of an infill site or small development, but if a precedent could be created and the envelope compromised, we would be very concerned about the implications that may have for the village.