

5. CHAPTER 5 - SHOPPING

5.1 PARAGRAPH 5.2 INTRODUCTION

The Objections

Dealt with at oral inquiry:

1601 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

Paragraph 5.2, objective 1, should be amended so that it refers to 'enhancing', rather than just protecting, the vitality and viability of Sudbury and Hadleigh. The wording 'in their defined town centres' should be rephrased to refer to 'supporting their role'.

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1058 Hadleigh Town Council

Paragraph 5.2 objective 3, should include the following additional words to show the basis for the [Health Check] reports. After the words 'Check Reports' add 'to clearly show that the Report conforms to the latest Government guidelines.'

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.1.1 The Council has included "enhance" in amended Objective 1. However, even Conservation Area legislation only requires that development should preserve *or* enhance the character or appearance of the area. It does not require enhancement in every case. By inference a neutral effect is acceptable as harm would not be caused. A negative effect would not be acceptable. I consider Objective 1 should be reworded to **protect or enhance**. The alternative wording "in supporting their role" would be acceptable but in my view the policy as worded would achieve the same result

5.1.2 The Objective as written is concise. It is not necessary to mention government policy statements or guidelines as the Council would have to adhere to them anyway, or make it clear in any report, why it has not done so.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify Objective 1 by deleting "To protect and enhance" and commence with **To protect or enhance**.

5.2 PARAGRAPH 5.7 THE RETAIL STRATEGY

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1127 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce

Paragraph 5.7 deals with retail strategy and makes reference to the retail competition from Bury St Edmunds, Colchester, Ipswich and to a lesser degree, Haverhill and Stowmarket.

The Chamber wish to remind the District Council that Sudbury is located on the Suffolk / Essex border. It therefore receives the goodwill of the population living in its hinterland of rural north Essex. The Chamber considers competition to be greater from Halstead and Braintree (in Essex) than from Haverhill and Stowmarket (in Suffolk). This is material in the context of the future development of Sudbury and the transport infrastructure into and around the town.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.2.1 The Council recognised the relationship of the towns in Essex and amended the paragraph. This objection has been met.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.3 POLICY SP01 THE RETAIL STRATEGY

The Objections

Dealt with at oral inquiry:

1316 The Hadleigh Society

Suggest that Policy SP01 be amended to read: '..protect and enhance the historic character, the vitality and the viability of Sudbury and Hadleigh town centres..'

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1292 Mrs J Byrne

The intention to attempt to direct major retail investment into Hadleigh is not appropriate for a town of its size. The encouragement of 'modest retail development' in Hadleigh of the suggested size (1,400 sq. metres net) is only likely to come forward in the form of a supermarket. Although this may attract more shoppers into the town, it would also be likely to cause the closure of small food shops (as evidenced recently by cases in Sudbury). To maintain the nature and appeal of the High Street there is a need to encourage small shops to open and for the existing Co-op store to increase its appeal.

9486 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

(Support for this policy reiterated but) The minor change to wording needs to be changed for clarity.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.3.1 I consider that "protect or enhance" as now proposed by the Council is the appropriate wording for the policy. I find the intent of the policy as amended to be clear, particularly when related to paragraph 5.14 of the supporting text.
clear
- 5.3.2 Policy SPO1 of itself, neither encourages nor discourages supermarket development. It is for the the Council to assess in the first instance whether a supermarket proposal in Hadleigh would protect or enhance its role as the second major town in the district, which is identified in the 2002 retail study as a highest order retail centre.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.4 PARAGRAPH 5.14b BABERGH RETAIL CAPACITY STUDY (2002)

The Objections

Dealt with at oral inquiry:

9487 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

The reference to the need for a major new food store in Hadleigh should be expanded. The preferable location for the food store should be identified as the Brett Works and adjoining land.

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

5329 Suffolk County Council

The third sentence presumably refers to Sudbury and Hadleigh. The paragraph would read better if these were mentioned specifically and the wording tightened up generally.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 5.14b Pre-Inquiry Change 89

Amend paragraph 5.14b, as follows: '...Given strong competition from much larger retail centres nearby (and in particular the need to avoid further 'leakage' of local trade to them) and forecast population in the ~~Babergh~~ **Hadleigh and Sudbury towns'** catchment areas, it is imperative to protect and wherever possible, strengthen their vitality and viability.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.4.1 Paragraph 5.14b has been added by Pre Inquiry Change 89. I consider the change is helpful in identifying the results of the retail study but do not agree that there is need to mention specific sites in this paragraph.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 89

5.5 PARAGRAPH 5.14c BABERGH RETAIL CAPACITY STUDY (2002)

The Objections

Dealt with at oral inquiry:

9488 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

The reference to the need for a major new food store in Hadleigh should be expanded. The preferable location for the food store should be identified as the Brett Works and adjoining land.

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

6941 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions

Objecting against the "independent consultants' Retail Study" which reached the conclusion that there was "a need for a major food store to serve Hadleigh." Objector's analysis of the Retail Study is that the methodology and conclusions are unreliable. Propose that the Council consider again the whole basis of the Babergh Retail Study with more thorough, testing, methodology. A further reason for a review is that the study is significantly out of date in relation to the qualitative need issue, following the Government's statement of 10 th April 2003 from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 'Parliamentary Statement on Town Centre Planning Policies'.

7508 Hadleigh Town Council

Paragraph 5.14c is misleading as it identifies a need for a major foodstore for Hadleigh, whereas the study by Colliers CRE states that the town is not large enough to attract multi-nationals.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.5.1 Evidence at the Inquiry did not lead me to conclude that the 2002 retail study was unreliable. I do not read the report as inferring that national food retailers are unlikely to be attracted to the town. See my detailed report on the Tesco proposal for the Brett Works site and adjoining land.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.6 PARAGRAPH 5.16 RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP GENERATING DEVELOPMENT – THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1605 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

The text in this paragraph can make specific reference to the inability to secure the scale of foodstore development needed within Hadleigh within its defined town centre area. As appropriate, reference can be made to the Secretary of State's recent appeal decision letter.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.1 Paragraphs 5.14b, 5.14c and 5.16 as amended refer generally to the retail needs of Hadleigh. As the Council has now specifically proposed the allocation of the Brett Works site and adjoining land following the First Secretary of States's appeal decision, I see no reason to enlarge the supporting text further.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.7 POLICY SP02 RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP GENERATING DEVELOPMENT – THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1606 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

The policy should be redrafted so that it makes clear that the identified need for improved food retailing to serve Hadleigh cannot be achieved within the [defined] town centre.

1714 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons

Delete both Policies SP02 and SP03 and replace with a new policy combining the main elements of both (see proposed wording on representation). This is in the interests of greater clarity of application, also greater certainty and consistency with PPG6 and related statements of Government policy. The definitions given in the existing policies should be retained.

2839 B & Q Plc/RPS plc

The application of the Sequential Approach as set out within the policy is supported. However, it is recommended that Policies SP02 and SP03 be redrafted and amalgamated to form a single, comprehensive policy for assessing retail development proposals. This would promote the Plan's clarity and reduce its repetitiveness. Justification is given for defining significant proposals, to which the policy relates as those over 280 square metres. In this respect, we consider that the Plan should adopt the approach set out in PPG6, which uses the term 'major shopping development' and applies a floorspace threshold of 2,500 square metres.

Policy SP02 should be redrafted incorporating part of SP03, as suggested below:

New shopping development outside the town centres of Hadleigh and Sudbury, as defined on the Proposals Map, will be permitted where the local planning authority are satisfied that:

- A) There is a need for the proposal
- B) The proposal is located in accordance with the sequential approach where first preference is for town centre sites, followed by edge of centre sites, district and local centres, only then out of centre sites.
- C) Either by itself or cumulatively with other permitted development, would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of local centres.
- D) Access and car parking arrangements are satisfactory and that local roads can accommodate anticipated traffic generation; and
- E) The site is readily accessible or can be made accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.7.1 With the specific proposal to allocate the Brett Works site and adjoining land, I do not consider it necessary to make reference to the lack of available town centre sites, particularly as Policy SP02 refers to leisure and other substantial trip generating development as well as retail.
- 5.7.2 I consider that combining Policies SP02 and SP03 would result in an overlong and complex policy. They should remain separate as their purposes are not the same.
- 5.7.3 The definition of "major" was added to paragraph 5.18a at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection. However, see the recently issued PPS6 and in particular paragraph 3.23, as the wording of paragraph 5.18a may need to be amended.

5.8 PARAGRAPH 5.18a RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP GENERATING DEVELOPMENT – THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

6946 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions

The paragraph is self-contradictory and unclear as to when retail impact assessment will be required. A clear size limit of less than 2500m² should be set, reflecting the advice of PPG6, paragraph 4.13, on small market towns.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.8.1 I consider paragraph 5.18a clarifies advice in PPG6. However, the wording should now also reflect PPS6 paragraph 3.23.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection but take into account PPS6 and in particular paragraph 3.23.

5.9 PARAGRAPH 5.19 RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP GENERATING DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRES

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1607 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

Reference should be made in this paragraph to the specific problems identified in Hadleigh and confirmed by the Secretary of State's recent appeal decision, that the identified requirement for further foodstore provision will need to be on a site outside the defined town centre at and adjoining the Brett Works, Hadleigh.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.9.1 As this objection relates to a specific site if any such change is necessary it should be in the Hadleigh Chapter of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.10 PARAGRAPH 5.20 RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP
GENERATING DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRES

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 5.14b Pre-Inquiry
Change 90**

Amend first sentence of para 5.20 to read:

'PPG6 (**and associated Government guidance**) advises that where out-of-centre developments are proposed, the following key considerations should be applied:

- the retail need for the development;'
(*other criteria retained*)

The Objections

None

5.11 POLICY SP03 RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP
GENERATING DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRES

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

664 GO-East

Objection to over-detailed and over-lengthy aspects of the policy / plan, plus possible repetition with other policies [such as SP02]. Also, unnecessary to give details of submissions required in support of planning applications or to make reference to the use of planning conditions or Section 106 Obligations.

There is also no reference to 'need' in the policy. Supporting text could usefully state that conditions will be used to limit the range of goods to the identified need. Also note that sale of cars and motorcycles is not classified as A1 use class.

1609 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

Other policies already address many of the issues raised. Some criteria are inappropriately phrased for a policy that asks for matters to be considered against relevant criteria. For example, the ninth criterion should not be phrased in such a prescriptive manner. The qualification to the provision of retail impact analysis evidence is unnecessary as any professional assessment will need to meet appropriate standards.

The reference to specific types of goods needs to refer back to retail warehouses so that it is clear that stores selling primarily convenience goods are not restricted in terms of ranges of goods.

1715 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons

Delete both Policies SP02 and SP03 and replace with a new policy (see proposed wording on representation). This is in the interests of greater clarity of application, also greater certainty and consistency with PPG6 and related statements of Government policy. The definitions given in the existing policies should be retained.

2840 B & Q Plc/RPS plc

In terms of reference to the Sequential Approach, Policy SP03 repeats the subject matter of Policy SP02 and is, therefore, unnecessarily repetitive. The importance of many of its requirements is acknowledged but these could be usefully combined in a redrafted Policy SP02 (see representation 2839).

The policy should not seek to protect employment land, which is dealt with elsewhere, under Policy EM15. This criterion should, therefore, be deleted from the retail Policy.

The definition of bulky goods at the end of the policy is confusing and its final paragraph overly prescriptive. Retail proposals should be considered on their individual merits. Reference to the imposition of conditions should be in the supporting text and not the policy itself.

6878 John Lewis Partnership/Turley Associates

Objecting to rewording of Policy SP03 because it provides an inadequate basis for development control and has the potential to threaten the District's existing town centres. Objector would like the reference to 'Proposals...on allocated sites' in policy text to be deleted.

6949 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions

It is wholly unclear whether the Council will require retail impact assessments for retail developments on sites allocated in the Plan. Policy SP03 suggests that they cannot be sought, but para 5.20a suggests that they will. Objector notes that the impact of the retail development of the proposed site on the town centre has not been assessed in the Retail Study and considers that any application should therefore be made subject to a Retail Impact Study. Objector therefore suggests deletion of reference to 'Proposals...on sites allocated in the Local Plan'.

9233 Mr J Masters

This raises a curious and obscure point. Policy SP03 can be read in a reverse way, namely, substantial trip generation can be ignored if the site (for a Waste Transfer Station) is within an employment area allocated in the Local Plan. Babergh D.C are invited to clarify.

9527 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

Objection 1609 maintained and extended to include paragraph 5.20a. There is also a lack of clarity in terms of when a Green Travel Plan may be required.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SP03 Pre-Inquiry Change 91

Amend first paragraph of Policy SP03 to read:

'Proposals for significant new retail, leisure and other substantial trip generating developments, including convenience goods superstores and retail warehouses that cannot be located in defined town centres, ~~or on sites allocated in the Local Plan,~~ will be considered against the following criteria:

- the retail need for the development;'
- (other criteria retained)*

The Objections

13231 Tesco Stores Limited / Littman & Robeson

Object to the removal of the words "or other sites allocated in the Local Plan. If a need has been identified, the Local Plan should identify sites to accommodate that need.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.11.1 The Council has deleted the "too detailed" aspects of the policy, relating to impact analysis and lists of types of goods. Some have been relegated to the supporting text. The other criteria listed include the major principles established in the recently published PPS6. Although the principles are much the same as before the Council will need to consider whether the detailed wording of this and other town centre policies should be revised to be more in line with PPS6.
- 5.11.2 I accept that there is a degree of repetition between policies but I consider this is preferable to combining Policies SP02 and SP03. The resultant policy would be lengthy and over complex.
- 5.11.3 The phrase "or on sites allocated in the local plan", which I consider was superfluous, has been deleted to meet the objection.

- 5.11.4 A1 uses have not been specifically referred to in the policy and do not need to be. Details of uses are now in the supporting text to meet the objection.
- 5.11.5 I do not see how the criterion could be more specific in respect of Green Travel Plans. Such plans would only be required for major developments and/or very large trip generators. They would be likely to be "one off" proposals the impact of which could only be assessed at the application stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Apart from the suggestion in paragraph 5.11.1 above modify the Plan in accordance with Proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 91.

5.12 PARAGRAPH 5.20a RETAIL AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL TRIP GENERATING DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRES

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

9187 B&Q PLC/RPS plc

The definition of bulky goods is confusing.

9188 B&Q PLC/RPS plc

Objecting against the text: "will" should be replaced by "may." The paragraph is therefore overly prescriptive in stating that controls on types of goods sold will be used, rather than stating that these 'may' be used.

9189 B&Q PLC/RPS plc

The imposition of a condition is preferable to a Section 106 Agreement.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy 5.20a Pre-Inquiry Change 92

Amend first sentence of para 5.20a to read:

'The type of goods sold in these stores will be **limited to that of the identified need and** controlled by a planning condition or a ~~P~~planning ~~O~~obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.12.1 It is not clear to me from the wording of paragraph 5.20a why the definition of bulky goods is considered confusing.
- 5.12.2 I do not feel strongly about the use of "may" instead of "will". I suppose there may be circumstances where a condition or obligation would not be required but this would be rare. On balance retain existing wording.
- 5.12.3 I agree that a condition would be preferable to a Section 106 agreement but sometimes a planning obligation is necessary. The wording allows for both.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 92

5.13 POLICY SP04 SUBDIVISION OF OUT-OF-TOWN SUPERSTORES AND RETAIL WAREHOUSES

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

2841 RPS plc

Use of the term 'will' in reference to the application of conditions to prevent the subdivision of retail units is overly restrictive. The word 'will' should be replaced by 'may' to allow these proposals to be assessed on their own merits.

9495 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

Objection to the deletion of Policy SP04. Objector would like it to be reinstated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.13.1 This policy was deleted at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage. It was unnecessary as it merely stated an intent to impose a planning condition. In my view paragraph 5.21 of the supporting text is sufficient to explain why a condition may be necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.14 POLICY SP06 SHOPS IN LOCAL CENTRES AND VILLAGES

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

667 GO-East

The development plan should offer certainty and clarity. The phrasing of the plan policies is fundamental to this. Some phrases introduce doubt as to whether planning permission will or will not be granted and these should be avoided. For example, the use of phrases such as "generally" "development may be permitted"; "may, in some circumstances"; exceptionally; "particular attention will be paid to"; "will encourage" "give favourable consideration to" ; "full regard will be paid to"; "supported"; "accepted" should be avoided.

8748;8749 The Countryside Agency

Policy should incorporate a similar market test to CR32 and CR33. In terms of evidence that a facility is no longer needed by the local community, our view is that it would be unreasonable to refuse a proposal for a change of use if demonstrated by market testing that a shop use was not commercially viable, simply due to the local community making a statement that they felt a need for the shop to remain.

8750 The Countryside Agency

Policy should incorporate a similar market test to CR32 and CR33.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.14.1 The policy wording has been tightened up to require "full supporting evidence" on non-viability. I have some concern about the wording of Policy SP06 based on the objections raised. It seems to me that whether the "community" or part of it, considers there is a local need, is not of particular relevance. If a shopping use is no longer viable, unless there is to be some kind of public subsidy it would not stay open. As a change from one shopping use to another does not generally require planning permission, the Local Planning Authority would only be involved where a change of use or redevelopment proposals are submitted. However, on balance I see

no reason to amend the policy as the Plan is read as a whole and Policy CR32, which includes shops, would also apply.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.15 PARAGRAPH 5.26 FARM SHOPS

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1061 Hadleigh Town Council

This objection also relates to Policy SP07 - farm shops. The Council supports the thrust of this proposal but believes that there should be planning controls governing the size of the shop area. Some farm shops are housed in a small part of a large barn (or similar type of building), the remainder of which could be opened up and used by other businesses not connected with farming or farm products. Some control is needed to prevent such abuse.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.15.1 SP07 is a criteria based policy which takes into account the impact of a farm shop on a range of issues. I do not consider it would be practical to attempt to define the operation by size. Where permission is necessary the Council is able to impose conditions restricting size and range of goods sold relative to the specific premises. This is mentioned in paragraph 5.27 of the supporting text which was amended at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.16 POLICY SP07 FARM SHOPS

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1062 Hadleigh Town Council

Policy SP07 states that 'Planning conditions may be used..' The word 'may' should be replaced with a stronger term like 'will' [be used].

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.16.1 I believe the word "may" is appropriate in the supporting text at paragraph 5.27 in this case. Whether a condition would be required would depend upon a number of factors, including the size of a building. A condition is unlikely to be required in every case.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.17 POLICY SP08 LATE-NIGHT TRADING RESTRICTIONS

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1611 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

The policy should be amended so that it relates to establishments selling hot takeaway food and drink and cannot be interpreted as applying to food and grocery stores.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.17.1 As this policy was deleted at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage the objection has been met. The Council has added a new paragraph in the supporting text at 5.29a clarifying the type of premises referred to.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.18 PARAGRAPH 5.29a LATE-NIGHT TRADING RESTRICTIONS

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

9496 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson

Objection maintained. The policy should be amended so that it relates to establishments selling hot takeaway food and drink and cannot be interpreted as applying to food and grocery stores.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy 5.29a Pre-Inquiry Change 93

Amend paragraph to read:

'In considering planning applications for establishments selling food and drink for consumption on or off the premises **(A3 uses, as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended)**, ~~the District Council will restrict~~ trading hours **will be restricted** to protect residential amenity from night-time and early-morning disturbance, where appropriate.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.18.1 I consider the objection has been reasonably met by the pre inquiry change clarifying that the restrictions would apply to uses in A3.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 93.

5.19 POLICY OR TEXT OMISSIONS

The Objections

Dealt with at oral inquiry:

1602 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

A further objective should be added addressing the need for Sudbury and Hadleigh to act as focal points for major retail development to serve these major service centres.

1603 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

Add further paragraph explaining the need for better supermarket provision to serve Hadleigh and the sustainability, as well as vitality and viability benefits that would thus arise. Reference should also be made to the specific scale of need identified to meet the requirements for food retailing to serve Hadleigh. As appropriate, reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision [following a recent planning appeal].

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

1059 Hadleigh Town Council

Within the retail strategy paragraphs some reference should be included to indicate that the Plan will encourage the operation of small / specialist shops to compete against the larger stores. The Council suggests a new policy to cover this concern, worded (broadly) as follows:

'The District Council recognises the importance of small / specialist retail outlets and will encourage such businesses to move into and operate in its area.'

1064 Hadleigh Town Council

The Council notes that there is no reference to the operation of petrol service stations and believes that this aspect should be considered and some guidance / comment included in the Plan.

1411 Tesco Stores Limited/Healey & Baker

The objection is to the overall Shopping Chapter as it does not refer to, nor set out any criteria for, the development of retail uses in the Chilton Mixed Use Development Area.

1608 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson

Object to the omission of a policy statement allocating land at the Brett Works, Hadleigh, and adjoining land, to accommodate a foodstore of the scale identified in the Secretary of State's recent decision letter.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.19.1 Policy SP02 recognises the importance of both Sudbury and Hadleigh as locations for major new retail uses. Paragraph 5.19 describes the restrictions which may be imposed on development because of the existing character of the town centre. As the importance of these two centres to accommodate major new retail uses is already recognised in Policy SP02 I see no need for a further objective. More specific reference to the importance of Hadeigh as a location for new retail uses is recognised in the Hadleigh Town Chapter of the Plan

- 5.19.2 SP06 as amended supports small retailers and ensures that local shops are not lost to other uses without very good reason. A further policy which merely encourages small shops is not an effective tool for development control.
- 5.19.3 There are very few proposals for new petrol filling stations. In my view they do not need a specific policy to control them.
- 5.19.4 I consider that the Chilton Mixed Use Development Chapter is the appropriate place for commenting on the provision of retail uses within that proposed development package.
- 5.19.5 As the Council now propose the allocation of a foodstore on the Brett Works site and adjoining land in the Hadleigh Chapter this objection has been met. See my report on the Brett Works site.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

5.20 MISCELLANEOUS

The Objections

Dealt with in written rebuttal:

34 Mr R A Smith

Apply District-wide considerations to Policies SP01, SP02, and SP03. It is clear in other parts of the summary that particular areas will be considered, otherwise why would items like Policies TP11 and TP12 exist?

37 Mr R A Smith

Much of the Commentary seems geared to endorse a view of society without real (evidential?) backing, such as SP01, Trips, Modes, etc. These are highly debatable at the least.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.20.1 All three of the policies were drafted in a district wide context in conformity with the Structure Plan, although Policies SP01 and SP02 refer to specific urban locations. It is not clear to what change is being suggested in the second objection. There are numerous core documents which provide evidence of studies and assessments on which the plan is based.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection
