

3 CHAPTER 3 SETTLEMENT POLICY AND HOUSING

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The Objections

347 House Builders Federation

The plan should set out as policy commitment to meeting the Structure Plan requirement through housing completions. It would also be appropriate to make objectives 2,4 and 5 general policies.

354 Redbourne Ltd/Earl and Lawrence

Whilst the overall provision of additional housing provision is noted, the concentration of a major part of new development at Sudbury is inappropriate. More housing development to reflect the proximity and influence of Ipswich as a major centre is required.

378 Sproughton Parish Council

Support a better mix/type of housing. All new developments should have a good mix of house types, sizes etc. Social housing, local needs etc should be fully integrated within a development and not grouped. It is essential that a community has a full spectrum of housing to enable people to 'move around' within the community as their housing needs change. It is recommended that a policy be introduced to ensure that this happens.

862 E and J E Suckling/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

870 Mr D E Baker/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

Whilst the overall provision of additional housing is noted, the concentration of a major part of new development at Sudbury is inappropriate and fails to satisfy Objective 2 seeking to balance the mix and location of additional housing provision. More housing development to reflect the proximity and influence of Ipswich as a major centre is required.

863 E and J E Suckling/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

The policy should be more site specific in seeking to address special needs and, in particular, affordable housing provision within village settlements.

1258 A W Mayhew (Farms) Ltd Summers/ Wykes-Sneyd;1281 Mr C A Amoss/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1749 Exors C Easterbrook/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1756 Lady Bristol Summers/Wykes-Sneyd;1763 Tendring Hall Estate/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

The scale and concentration of additional housing provision within a new development at Sudbury is inappropriate and fails to satisfy Objective 2. More housing development to reflect the proximity and influence of Ipswich as a major centre is required.

1519 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Objective 3

The objectives should comprise matters of broad rather than introduce site specific issues that have yet to be tested through the planning process. Delete: 'providing for a major mixed use development on the northern edge of Sudbury'.

2067 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

2106 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

Objective 3

Support objective but propose a minor wording change.

The objective (3) refers to providing an appropriate level of new housing in sustainable villages and objective 4 provides some clarification, it would be beneficial to cross refer to that objective for the purpose of clarification.

Proposed amendment: 'and an appropriate level of sustainable new housing in villages, that accord with objective 4 below.'

2107 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

Objective 4

PPG3/PPG13 support new housing in areas served by existing public transport or with the potential to be well served. The potential to improve public transport accessibility either as a result of committed improvements or as a result of development itself is very much material to the location of development. New development can produce net gains in transportation infrastructure that can help to reduce the need for travel by car from existing development as well as new development.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.1 Pre-Inquiry Change 29

Amend to read: 'This chapter deals with Settlement Policy and provides specific guidance on the provision and location of housing

in the Plan period. It covers, among other things, the allocation of sites for new housing development ~~and the phased release of this land~~; housing for local and special needs; affordable housing; and design and environmental good practice in housing developments. The chapter refers to related issues of recreation, transportation and the built environment, which are dealt with in detail under the appropriate chapter headings.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.1.1 In this introduction I have taken the opportunity to comment on a number of objections related to housing and this avoids the need for me to repeat my conclusions elsewhere throughout my report where similar objections are raised. On the other hand I have not commented in detail on other objections raised above as I have dealt with them when reporting on specific topics and policies in the Plan.
- 3.1.2 Planning Policy Guidance Note. 3 requires authorities to adopt a sequential approach to the identification of new housing sites. This search starts with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings in urban areas. These are identified in the Urban Capacity Study for Babergh (CD/41) and the Topic Paper on Housing (CD91). The next priorities are urban extensions, and then new development nodes in good public transport corridors. This approach is part of the government's "sustainable communities" plan.
- 3.1.3 Structure Plan Policy CS7 follows the sequential search sequence and Policy CS3 identifies a hierarchy of development locations, including in particular in Babergh District the major town of Sudbury. This is reflected in the emerging Local Plan at Policy CP01 – The Chilton Mixed Use Development. The district is predominantly rural with only two towns and there is limited opportunity for brownfield development. This has resulted in a number of greenfield allocations.
- 3.1.4 There have been arguments throughout the Inquiry whether the balance between urban and rural housing

growth is soundly based. Objectors have both considered that there should be more development in or on the edge of urban areas, particularly the Ipswich fringe, and others are of the view that there should be more development in villages to encourage growth and support existing facilities. I am inclined to the view that the balance is about right. However, this balance will change slightly more in favour of towns and larger villages if my recommendations are accepted.

- 3.1.5 Sites in the Ipswich Fringe Area are as sustainable as sites elsewhere in the district, and to concentrate development around Ipswich might be an easy way of meeting Structure Plan requirements. It would, however, ignore the identified economic and housing needs of all parts of the district. On the basis of the Urban Capacity Study the majority of capacity over the plan period (51%) would be located in Sudbury and Great Cornard and 15% in Hadleigh being the only two towns in the district. Villages would take varying degrees of development

Housing Provision

- 3.1.6 The Structure Plan identifies a net housing increase of 6,900 during the plan period 1996-2016. This equates to the building of 345 dwellings for each of the 20 years of the Plan. According to Table 2 of the Housing Topic Paper (CD/91) of the 6,900 dwellings, 2300 had been completed between 1996-2004 (an average of 288 per annum). The Local Plan needs to ensure the delivery of 4600 dwellings during the remainder of the Plan period (an average of 383 dwellings per annum), an increase in recent delivery rates.
- 3.1.7 Objectors raise doubts as to whether some of the allocations will come forward because of costly infrastructure, or physical limitations, or what they consider are excessive S106 planning gain requirements, or affordable housing requirements on small sites. Also objectors are concerned that the figure of 4600 for the remainder of the plan period is an underestimation of what is actually required, and that the requirement for a Local Plan to identify at least 10 years housing land supply will not be met.

- 3.1.8 Based upon the research by Roger Tyms objectors consider that a 10% discount figure should be used to determine the Commitments figure in Table 2 of the Housing Topic Paper (CD91) I would normally agree that this is a good guide but in the present case the County has come up with a specific figure of 5% based on its own assessment and improved local monitoring, which I consider should be used rather than a general countrywide figure. The Panel dealing with the EIP in 2000 saw no reason to question the County's conclusion, broadly supported by the Districts, that in calculating the proportion of commitments on allocated sites and likely to come forward a discount of 5% should be applied.
- 3.1.9 I tend to agree that with the restrictions imposed on development that the windfall figure is high, but even with these restrictions which are a matter for negotiation, and are not applicable to every site, I would not put the figure any where near as low as that suggested by the Objectors. I have also recommended that some of the restrictions be lessened. Based on the recent total incidence of windfall permissions, and the factors mentioned above, only a reduction of about 300 is justified.
- 3.1.10 As far as Local Plan allocations are concerned I would normally agree with the Objectors that a 10% reduction should be made for non-implementation. However, from the evidence at Inquiry, it seems to me that the total of 1380 is a very conservative estimate of the number of dwellings likely to be provided during the Plan period by allocation, and I believe this could well compensate for that 10% reduction.
- 3.1.11 I do conclude that with a reduced number of windfalls, and taking into account demolitions and dwelling losses, (a small number difficult to assess) that the Council would miss its target to meet the Structure Plan requirements during the Plan period by a small margin. However, I do not consider this to be critical because my recommendations include additional allocations, and the Council has also agreed mixed use developments and other increases in densities since Table 2 was prepared, which I believe should make up for the overall deficiency and also compensate for my

recommended deletions. I have recommended allocations in Glemsford, Great Cornard (alternative larger site), increases in housing numbers at Lady Lane, Hadleigh, and Brantham is able to accommodate mixed-use development, agreed during the Inquiry.

- 3.1.12 Paragraph 30 of Planning Policy Guidance No. 3 states that local planning authorities should only seek to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirements set as a result of the RPG and strategic planning process. They do not have to consider all the land in the area. A number of "Omission sites" have been proposed but as in my view there is no need for the allocation of more land because of what I have said in the previous paragraph, I have not reported on each omission site in detail.

* * *

- 3.1.13 Although I have seen policies in Local Plans based on objectives 2,4 and 5 as there are a number of policies in this Plan, which together reflect them, I do not consider these need to be repeated as general policies.
- 3.1.14 With the allocations made, together with the modifications I have recommended, I consider the Local Plan reflects the requirements of the Structure Plan and the needs of the district during the Plan period. Proposed housing provision within Ipswich, the responsibility of Ipswich Borough Council, also needs to comply with the Structure Plan.
- 3.1.15 There is a framework of policies in the plan dealing with social housing. Their detailed implementation is not a Local Plan matter.
- 3.1.16 Although I agree that Objectives would not as a rule be site specific in this case I am satisfied that Objective 3 reflects an important strategic objective in the Structure Plan and should be included. I agree with the addition of the word "sustainable" in the last line as it is the larger villages with a range of facilities which can accommodate housing growth without undue reliance on the private car.

- 3.1.17 A recent Urban Capacity Study (CD41) has been carried out and the Council has reviewed planning permissions and commitments to update housing figures. These figures are included in the Housing Topic Paper (CD91). See my comments on the adequacy of housing supply above.

RECOMMENDATION

As I have concluded that Structure Plan housing requirements can be met during the Plan period I make no specific recommendations here. My recommendations throughout the plan on allocated sites, omissions sites and policies deal with the range of objections raised.

3.2 PARAGRAPH 3.2 POLICY CONTEXT

The Objections

2068 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Para 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.1 See introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

See introduction to this chapter.

3.3 PARAGRAPH 3.3 POLICY CONTEXT

1750 Exors C Easterbrook/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1757 Lady Bristol/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1764 Tendring Hall Estate/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

The policy should be more site specific in seeking to address special needs and, in particular, affordable housing provision within village settlements.

2069 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.1 Paragraph 3.3 lays down the policy concept. I have dealt with Affordable Housing separately in the Plan.

3.3.2 See Introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to paragraph 3.3 in response to these objections

3.4 PARAGRAPHS 3.4 - 3.8 POLICY CONTEXT

The Objections

2070-2074 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016. In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District. No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.4.1 See introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

See introduction to this chapter.

3.5 PARAGRAPH 3.7 POLICY CONTEXT

The Objections

2618 Mr P J Holbrook

50% of all new dwellings to be built on previously developed land simply means that houses are built where employment used to be and the owner make a profit. Greenfield sites are then used for employment sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.5.1 The Council is merely repeating what is stated in regional planning guidance. How it is implemented is a matter for more detailed policies in the plan which I have dealt with in this chapter and the employment chapter of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.6 PARAGRAPH 3.8 POLICY CONTEXT

The Objections

**A W Mayhew (Farms) Ltd/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1283 Mr C
A Amoss/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1751 Exors C
Easterbrook/Summers 864 E and J E Suckling/Summers
Wykes-Sneyd;872 Mr D E Baker/Summers Wykes-
Sneyd;1260 Wykes-Sneyd;1758 Lady Bristol/Summers
Wykes-Sneyd;1765 Tendring Hall Estate/Summers Wykes-
Sneyd**

The policy does not adequately recognise the importance of village settlements in forming a strong community pattern across the District.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.6.1 It is not clear to me how the policy context of paragraph 3.8 which focuses on the Structure Plan potential for desirable and acceptable levels of sustainable development in Babergh as a whole, would relate to village settlements forming a strong community pattern across the district.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.7 PARAGRAPH 3.10 POPULATION

The Objections

2076 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.7.1 See Introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.8 PARAGRAPHS 3.11 - 3.13 EXISTING HOUSING IN BABERGH

The Objections

2077-2079 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.8.1 See Introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.9 PARAGRAPH 3.14 BABERGH HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY

The Objections

2080 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.9.1 See Introduction above

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.10 PARAGRAPH 3.15 STRUCTURE PLAN HOUSING PROVISION

The Objections

348 House Builders Federation

The derivation of Table 1 is not properly explained. A table should be included that set out the position at base date on completions, permissions not started and permissions under construction, allocations brought forward and windfalls/ urban capacity to arrive at a residual requirement that can be used in local inquiry. The Structure Plan requires District Council to review outstanding permissions outside towns and estimate how many are not going to be renewed and also to assess any shortfall in the incidence of

windfalls in order to arrive at a figure for large site. It is unclear if this has been done or not.

355 Redbourne Ltd/Earl and Lawrence

Appears to be a reliance upon windfall sites for 26% of the total; it should be possible and is desirable to identify a higher proportion of specific sites for future development within the District.

429 Mr T D Gray

The total figure, based upon the Suffolk County Council Housing Provision, includes Windfalls of 1800 proposed dwellings being 26% of the total Housing Requirements. No evidence is given in the First Deposit Draft to support the Windfalls total or to indicate that it is a realistic figure. The figure is an over-estimation of windfalls as the supply of windfalls diminishes year by year. Windfalls tend to be brownfield sites and there seems to be a small number of brownfield sites available.

865 E and J E Suckling/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;873 Mr D E Baker/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1261 A W Mayhew (Farms) Ltd/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1284 Mr C A Amoss/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1752 Exors C Easterbrook/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1759 Lady Bristol/Summers Wykes-Sneyd;1766 Tendring Hall Estate/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

The policy makes reliance upon windfall sites for 26% of the total; it should be possible and is desirable to identify a higher proportion of specific sites for future development within the District.

1518 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

No justification is being provided for the windfall provision of 1800 dwellings. There is no indication as to whether or not this includes an element greenfield windfall sites. Windfall provision should be reduced since sites that would be expected to contribute are in part proposed to be allocated in the Local Plan as brownfield sites. Propose that windfall contribution should be no greater than 1200 houses for the period 1996 - 2011.

1907 Bellway Homes Ltd

The windfall figure of 1800 units seems high. Has the District Council historically achieved windfall completions of over 100 units per annum and if they have, is it likely that this can be sustained for the next 15 years?

Existing commitments of 3600 units along with the new 1500 Local Plan allocations should be PPG3 compliant. The council need to demonstrate that these sites have been effectively audited and can subsequently withstand the scrutiny of a Local Plan process. The urban capacity study should provide the necessary assurances. A 10% allowance for non- implementation should be made for dwelling commitments and urban capacity study sites.

2075,2081 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

2108 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

The Local Plan does not set out the basis for the assumptions made in respect of existing commitments or windfalls (housing allocations). Neither does it allow for potential non-implementation. The plan should contain a fuller assessment of the likely contribution of existing commitments and windfall development to meeting housing needs, taking into account a review of existing commitments against the criteria for site allocation and the potential for non-implementation, and that the figures be amended in accordance with that assessment.

2138 Mr J F Tinworth

Urban need always did show higher demand as towns act as magnets for these who are 'in need'. The quote 30% of development for local need therefore means 70% of proposed figures are not needed.

9113 Mr & Mrs F May/Fenn Wright

Objecting against the accuracy of amendments to paragraph 3.15.

Table 1

9205 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning Conditional Withdrawal

Having 'corrected' items 2 and 3 of Table 2, the actual level of provision from completions, commitments and potential windfall development in 5,104 leaving a shortfall compared to the 6,900 unit requirement of around 1,800 units (1796 exactly), compared to the 1,460 units suggested in the Plan.

Turning finally to the last element of the table, the Council propose a number of sites in Policy HS09 to make up the figure of 1,460 -

we dispute some of the availability/capacity of these sites separately under our objection to that policy. Irrespective of this objection, however, and following our other proposed amendments to Table 2 to take account of non-implementation, there is a shortfall of 336 units which the Plan fails to make provision for. We commend the objector's site at Brantham as a suitable opportunity for around 200-250 dwellings within the Plan period.

Finally we consider that the retention of Table 1 is no longer necessary, since it sets out a historical land supply position, and we suggest that it should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.10.1 See Introduction

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.11 PARAGRAPH 3.15b STRUCTURE PLAN HOUSING PROVISION

The Objections

7803 House Builders Federation

This paragraph refers to the fact that since the Suffolk Structure Plan was adopted in 2001 it has come to light that a level of double counting of completions is included in the Plan, which over estimated the 1996-1999 completion rates. This is a matter of concern to the HBF.

7805 House Builders Federation

The paragraph mistakenly refers to the fact that Appendix 3 of the plan provides the Council's response to urban Capacity Study sites lists as potential residential site which are 0.3 hectares or above. However Appendix 3 in the Plan actually refers to Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Table 2

7804 House Builders Federation

The plan sets out a revised 2002 figure for Housing Provision 1996-2016 (Table 2) showing the various sources of housing supply **9200**

ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning Conditional Withdrawal

Table 2. PPG3 advises that existing 'commitments' should be reviewed before being carried forward in a new Local Plan, and there is no evidence that such an exercise has been undertaken.

9201 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning Conditional Withdrawal

Objects as it is normal practice to discount existing commitments by around 10% for potential and non-implementation when assessing land supply. In this case the Council appear to have applied a more limited discount of 5%. We object on the basis 10% is more reasonable.

9203 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning Conditional Withdrawal

The identified discounted capacity according to the Council is actually 475 units (see 13th February 2003 Strategy Committee Report, Appendix 3). The figure of 600 units in the plan has been 'rounded up' for no obvious reason.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.15b Pre-Inquiry Change 30

Amend to read: 'Since the Structure Plan was adopted in 2001 it has come to light that a level of double counting of completions is included in that Plan, which over estimated the 1996-1999 completion rates. In addition, consultants were appointed in June 2002 to undertake an Urban Capacity Study (November 2002). This provided a detailed assessment of both the small windfall and larger windfall sites available within Babergh. Further work has been undertaken since taking receipt of the Urban Capacity Study to refine the information provided. ~~Appendix 3 provides the Councils response to these sites listed as potential residential sites which are 0.3 hectares or more.~~ This study reveals that more larger sites are needed to be allocated than originally envisaged when the First Deposit Draft was published in September 2001.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.11.1 See Introduction

RECOMMENDATION

Modify paragraph 3.15b in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 30

3.12 PARAGRAPH 3.16 URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

2082 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.12.1 See Introduction

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.13 PARAGRAPH 3.17 URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

1908 Bellway Homes Ltd

There is a lack of urban capacity work to properly inform this exercise (housing allocation). The recognition of this is welcomed as is the admission that the figures currently presented are likely to change.

2083 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

9115 Mr & Mrs F May/Fenn Wright

The UCS has its own shortcomings, particularly as it acknowledges in paragraph 3.12 of the UCS that the Chilton Mixed Use Development was to be excluded from its considerations, on the instruction of the Council.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.13.1 See Introduction

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.14 PARAGRAPH 3.17b URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

7806 House Builders Federation

Paragraph discusses the methodology and discounting arrangements in respect of the Council's Urban Capacity Study and explains how based upon and assumed density of 40 dwellings per hectare a theoretical capacity of 1142 dwellings was later discounted down to 600 dwellings. The assumed density rates very high. The HBF may well wish to submit further comments in relation to this figure, and also about the discounting process, including the level of developer involvement in assessing the commercial viability of the sites identified with a capacity for 600 dwellings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.14.1 See Introduction

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.15 PARAGRAPH 3.17c URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

7807 House Builders Federation

Paragraph discusses the methodology and discounting arrangements in respect of the Council's Urban Capacity Study and explains how based upon an assumed density of 40 dwellings per hectare a theoretical capacity of 1142 dwellings was later discounted down to 600 dwellings. The assumed density rates are very high.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.15.1 See Introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.16 PARAGRAPH 3.17d URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

5324 Suffolk County Council

In the last line the word should be reduced rather than reduce.

7808 House Builders Federation

Paragraph discusses the methodology and discounting arrangements in respect of the Council's Urban Capacity Study and explains how based upon an assumed density of 40 dwellings per hectare a theoretical capacity of 1142 dwellings was later discounted down to 600 dwellings. The assumed density rates are high..

9202 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning Conditional Withdrawal

The identified discounted capacity according to the Council is actually 475 units (see 13th February 2003 Strategy Committee Report, Appendix 3). The figure of 600 units in the plan has been 'rounded up' for no obvious reason.

**9204 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning
Conditional Withdrawal**

Rather than 'rounding up' the 475 units, we consider that a suitable discount should be applied - 10% for example - to take account of the difficulty in actually delivering housing on these sites. This would lead to an estimate of urban capacity of around 427 units.

**B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.17d Pre-Inquiry
Change 31**

Change to: 'In addition, in relation to both the Retail Capacity Study (September 2002) and Employment Land Study (November 2002) it has been necessary to take a balanced view on the most appropriate land use for any given site. As a consequence of this additional sieving process, a number of sites identified in the UCS have been discounted, which has reduced the total capacity figure to 600.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.16.1 See Introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

Modify in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 31

3.17 PARAGRAPH 3.18 URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

1340 English Heritage

The overall balance of all allocations need to be considered in the light of the findings of the urban capacity study.

1909 Bellway Homes Ltd

There is a lack of urban capacity work to properly inform this exercise (housing allocation). The recognition of this is welcomed

as is the admission that the figures currently presented are likely to change.

2084 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.17.1 See Introduction.

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.18 PARAGRAPH 3.19 URBAN CAPACITY

The Objections

2085 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this

number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.18.1 See introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this Chapter

3.19 PARAGRAPHS 3.20 - 3.24 THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

2086-2090 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.19.1 See Introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.20 PARAGRAPH 3.23 THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

1481 Mr A Gordon/Fenn Wright

Regarding proposed development at East Bergholt, land off Orvis Lane (Rep 1478). It is considered that there are very few opportunities for housing on previously developed sites and that therefore the land at East Bergholt will be suitable for development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.20.1 This paragraph merely endorses the sequential approach and not the merits of individual sites.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.21 PARAGRAPH 3.24 THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

1802 Tarmac Southern Ltd/First City Ltd

Given the volume of development directed to Hadleigh previously and the fact that the town is close to its environmental capacity, according to Issues Report, it might be helpful, under the text relating to 'Towns', if there was an explanation to explain this reasoning resulting in the relatively small number of allocations at Hadleigh, given that it is a town. This would possibly be most appropriate under paragraph 3.24 that sets out the proposed role of Sudbury.

2109 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

It is considered that the phasing and trigger points specified require re-assessment but that in any event the Chilton Mixed-Use Package will not achieve 700 units until 2016, leaving a major housing shortfall in the proposed plan period of up to 2011. The level of housing capable of being implemented in the Local Plan to be reassessed against a realistic commencement date and rate of development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.21.1 Paragraph 3.24a has now been deleted. I do not consider its content was sound as one way improved infrastructure can occur is through development proposals.
- 3.21.2 The end date of the plan was put back to 2016 at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage. I do not consider a reduction in the 700 units is now necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.22 PARAGRAPH 3.24a THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

The Objections

3720 E & J Suckling/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

Objects because sequential tests does not satisfy housing objections.

5017 Mr J F Tinworth

This statement clashes with the current debate on Sudbury's current road structure. How is Sudbury not in need of an improved transport infrastructure? The reason for no growth in Hadleigh is invalid, what are the other reasons?

7810 House Builders Federation

It is stated that Hadleigh (the District's second largest town) will be able to only accommodate a very modest level of residential development over the Plan period without improved transport infrastructure. It is then stated that the District Council regards Hadleigh as close to its environmental capacity. No specific evidence is given to back up this assumption. The HBF does not consider that it is appropriate to heavily restrict development in the district's second largest town for the next 13 years. New development could provide an opportunity to address any perceived transport infrastructure inadequacies.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.24a Pre-Inquiry Change 32

Delete text: ~~Sequentially, Hadleigh forms the second town in Babergh. However, unlike Sudbury, it is not envisaged that Hadleigh will be able to accommodate more than a very modest level of residential development over the Plan period without~~

~~improved transport infrastructure, the District Council regards Hadleigh as close to its environmental capacity.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.22.3 This paragraph has been proposed for deletion. I do not consider its content was sound as one way that improved infrastructure could occur would be through development proposals.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete paragraph by modifying in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 32.

3.23 PARAGRAPH 3.24b PHASED RELEASE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Objections

3716 Mr D E Baker/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

Rigid application of sequential tests does not provide an adequate range of locations within the Babergh District from which housing needs can be met during the phased periods of the Plan.

3717 Mr D E Baker/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

This approach does not satisfy principle housing objectives that are set out.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.24b Pre-Inquiry Change 33

~~Delete text: 'Government guidance and the Suffolk Structure Plan require sites for housing development to be evaluated by a sequential approach to give priority to sites, that are easily accessible to jobs and services. In addition guidance in good practice has suggested that the release of sites should be pressed. In general, sites allocated in the two market towns are likely to satisfy the criteria of any sequential test. Nevertheless, additional sites coming forward (as well as those allocated) should be subjected to assessment under these tests not least to show their priority for development in relation to more rural sites elsewhere in~~

~~the district. The District Council will expect developers proposing housing development on sites over 15 dwellings, which are not allocated in this Plan, to demonstrate the need and timing of their development with reference to the Council's monitoring results; and why the site concerned should be released ahead of other sites phased in accordance with policy HS01a.'~~

The Objections

13218 Great Cornard Parish Council

Object to deletion.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.23.1 This paragraph on phasing policy has been proposed for deletion. I do not consider it was necessary as Structure Plan targets for completions are unlikely to be significantly exceeded.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 33

3.24 PARAGRAPH 3.24c PHASED RELEASE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Objections

7809 House Builders Federation

This paragraph of the plan identifies obstacles to some of the specified sites (Urban Capacity sites) coming forward for development.

8893 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

Support this paragraph, though concerned about the need to phase the development over a longer period to allow a reasonable rate of development.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.24c Pre-Inquiry Change 34

Delete text: ~~'The Urban Capacity Study has shown that very limited land is available from this source within Babergh. Some of the larger sites that have come forward and are being promoted as brownfield housing allocations in this Plan require the prior relocation of an existing business to a more suitable employment~~

~~location. However, the Employment Land Study has revealed a shortage of available employment land and some latent demand, so additional employment land needs to be brought forward as quickly as possible. The Chilton Mixed Use Development and the site at Lady Lane Hadleigh, both edge of town sites, are the key to unlocking much needed employment land. They will need to be bought forward as early as possible and phased over a longer period to allow a reasonable rate of development.~~

~~Policy HS01a implements Structure Plan policy CS7 with the phased release of residential land.'~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.24.1 This paragraph is proposed for deletion. Phasing of development no longer required and allocations have been made to meet employment needs during Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete paragraph in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 34

3.25 POLICY HS01a PHASED RELEASE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Objections

See Appendix 1 at the end of this chapter for details of objections

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Policy HS01a Pre-Inquiry Change 38

Delete text: '~~Sites for new housing development (both those allocated in this Plan and any new sites brought forward for more than 15 dwellings) will be released in a phased manner in accordance with the following order of preference:~~

- ~~1. sites within Sudbury and Hadleigh Town Centres;~~
- ~~2. sites located within the built up areas of Sudbury, Great Cornard and Hadleigh, which are capable of being served by public transport and have good cycle and pedestrian links to local shopping, employment, school and community facilities;~~

~~3. brownfield sites in sustainable villages which comply with policy HS03;~~

~~4. edge of both town and sustainable villages (consistent with policy HS03) sites, and;~~

~~5. sites in all other locations including greenfield sites on the edge of non-sustainable villages.~~

~~The release of sites by grant of planning permission will not be permitted until the date indicated in paragraph 3.24e (which forms part of this policy) unless monitoring of the rate of development and land available reveals that a change in timing is justified. Exceptions will be made for the following strategic sites, which will be brought forward as soon as possible, in order to deliver other important land use needs including employment land and affordable housing. These sites will be phased over a longer period, as appropriate to the development:~~

~~▪ Chilton mixed use development, and
Grays Close, Hadleigh.'~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.25.1 The phasing policy has been proposed for deletion. I have supported this deletion. See paragraph 3.24 above.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete policy in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 38

3.26 PARAGRAPH 3.24d PHASED RELEASE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Objections

7812 House Builders Federation

The paragraph states that developers proposing 15 dwellings or more on sites not allocated in the Plan will need to demonstrate the need and timing of their development, with reference to the Council's monitoring results; and why the site concerned should be released ahead of other sites phased in accordance with policy HS01a. The HBF is concerned that the phasing restrictions will have

an unwelcome impact on future housing supply figures given their restrictive nature.

**9221 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning
Conditional Withdrawal**

We see no requirement for paragraph 3.24d – if as a result of monitoring significant brownfield land does come forward, the Council could review the Plan (or a relevant part of it).

**B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.24d Pre-Inquiry
Change 35**

Delete text: '~~In accordance with both the Suffolk Structure Plan (paragraph 5.33) and the document entitled "Planning to Deliver", a delay in granting planning permission for some greenfield sites may occur (possibly until the next Local Plan period) if sufficient additional, unexpected brownfield development (in quantity or higher density or both) takes place earlier in the Plan period.'~~

The Objections

13219 Great Cornard Parish Council

Object to deletion.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.26.1 This paragraph is proposed for deletion. I have agreed above that a phasing policy is not required.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete paragraph by modifying in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 35

3.27 PARAGRAPH 3.24e AND TABLE 3 PHASED RELEASE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Objections

6004 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Objection to the phasing as shown in Table 3 as it is considered to be arbitrary and has not been discussed with owners/developers of the identified sites.

6005 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Objector points out that PPG3 includes a more flexible approach which may allow housing associated with villages to be implemented at an early stage in the plan period.

**6006 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning
Conditional Withdrawal**

Objecting about the current phasing in Table 3 as it would frustrate the early delivery of important recreational facilities.

**6007 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning
Conditional Withdrawal**

Re: HS09K Bures Road, Great Cornard. The approach to phasing is flawed and artificial.

**6008 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning
Conditional Withdrawal**

Objecting against the phased release as proposed for Bures Road (HS09K) in Table 3, because it would result in new residents moving onto an unfinished site and would remain in such state for a period of time. At the same time, implications on costs and delivery would occur in relation to infrastructure and affordable housing.

6009 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Objecting against the time allocated for the Bures Road, Gt Cornard developments. Objector would like the phasing to be amended to show commencement in the period 2002-2006 and showing completion of the site in the period 2007-2011.

6112 Mr C Notcutt/Bidwells Conditional Withdrawal

How is it that brownfield sites are likely to become available early on in the plan period, ahead of greenfield allocations, as specified by paragraph 3.24e? For instance, land at Church Farm, Whatfield is readily available for development. For the Local Plan to meet its dwelling targets such sites will need to be implemented sooner rather than later.

6728 M D Mills & M J Oliver/Whymark & Moulton

The phased plan sets dates too far ahead, as allocated sites may not be available to suit this timescale.

6959 Mr R R Pearce

Objecting to the exclusion of Capel St. Mary from any proposals for large scale residential development.

7813 7814 ouse Builders Federation

Paragraph 3.24c states that developers proposing 15 dwellings or more on sites not allocated in the Plan will need to demonstrate the need and timing of their development, with reference to the Council's monitoring results; and why the site concerned should be released ahead of other sites phased in accordance with policy HS01a. The HBF is concerned that the phasing restrictions will have an unwelcome impact on future housing supply figures given their restrictive nature.

9108 Mr & Mrs F May/Fenn Wright

Objecting to the exclusion of residential development at St Bartholomews Farm from paragraph 3.24e table 3.

9116 Mr & Mrs F May/Fenn Wright

It is doubtful whether all of the brownfield town centres identified in Table 3, can be delivered in time.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.24e Pre-Inquiry Change 36

Delete text: '~~The phased release of residential land allocated in this Plan is as follows in Table 3 below. Town centre and urban brownfield sites are likely to become available early in the plan period 2002-6 with rural brownfield and urban expansion development in the 2007-2012 period with rural greenfield in the final period 2012-2016.~~'

The Objections

None

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Table 3 Pre-Inquiry Change 37

Delete Table 3 and note referring to Bures Road, Great Cornard phasing allocations from Local Plan.

The Objections

13220 Great Cornard Parish Council

Object to table 3 deletion and the note referring to Great Cornard.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.27.1 This paragraph is now proposed for deletion. I have agreed with this conclusion that as there is unlikely to be over provision, as such phasing is not necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete this paragraph and table 3 in accordance with Pre Inquiry Changes 36 and 37

3.28 PARAGRAPH 3.25 SETTLEMENT POLICY

The Objections

1196 Mr B W Southgate/Edward Gittins and Associates

The Settlement Policy as described in paragraph 3.25 and the schedule of settlements classified as 'villages' in policy HS03 could usefully be refined to assist the application of The Sequential Approach. The definition of 'Group' and its expression in Policy HS02 are not consistent with one another.

2091 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and this Company believes that if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements. The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.28.1 I agree that the village classification system is confusing. See my consideration of Policies HS02 and HS03 below. See also my introduction to the Settlement Policy and Housing Chapter on the allocation of housing sites to meet Structure Plan requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

See my recommendations on Policies HS02 and HS03 below.

3.29 PARAGRAPH 3.26 TOWNS/URBAN AREAS

The Objections

1804 Tarmac Southern Ltd/First City Ltd

Given the volume of development directed to Hadleigh previously and the fact that the town is close to its environmental capacity, according to Issues Report, it might be helpful under the text

relating to 'Towns', if there was an explanation to explain this reasoning resulting in the relatively small number of allocations at Hadleigh, given that it is a town. This would possibly be most appropriate under paragraph 3.24 that sets out the proposed role of Sudbury.

2092 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.29.1 I have supported the deletion of paragraph 3.24a where reference is made to environmental constraints in Hadleigh. I do not consider that these need to be mentioned in paragraph 3.24 of the supporting text as the characteristics of Hadleigh are mentioned in other chapters of the plan. See also the Introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.30 PARAGRAPH 3.27 TOWNS/URBAN AREAS

The Objections

1555 Mr D Cooke

In paragraph 3.27 Great Cornard is classified as a Town while in policy HS09K a contradictory classification is made.

2093 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.30.1 HS09K is no longer shown as a village site. See Introduction to this chapter

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.31 PARAGRAPHS 3.28 - 3.29 TOWNS/URBAN AREAS

2094-2095 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Para 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.31.1 See Introduction.

RECOMMENDATION

See Introduction to this chapter

3.32 PARAGRAPH 3.30 VILLAGES

The Objections

1960 Barratt Eastern Counties/D L & P Consultants Ltd

The objector note that the distribution of development should accord with a sequential approach, they consider that the settlement policy should reflect the advice in PPG 3 to the effect that the majority of rural housing should be concentrated in villages identified as rural service centres in development plans. The plan fails to distinguish rural service centres from minor villages.

Amend:

Delete the last sentence of the paragraph and add additional words: 'including daily public transport. These larger and better served villages are classified as rural service centres and are likely to be the most sustainable location for development needed to support the rural economy.'

2096 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

2200 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

The settlement policy should reflect that the majority of rural housing should be concentrated in villages identified as rural service

centres in development plans. The Plan fails to distinguish rural service centres from minor villages. The following additional words should be added and the last sentence deleted:

'..including daily public transport. These larger and better served villages are classified as rural service centres and are likely to be the most sustainable location for development needed to support the rural economy.'

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.30 Pre-Inquiry Change 39

Amend as follows: 'Villages normally comprise upwards of 25 to 30 dwellings grouped together and normally offer at least once facility, such as a post office, food shop or **public house**. Some are sizeable settlements consisting of up to several hundred houses. Many will have a better range of facilities including daily public transport. Villages are not individually identified in the Suffolk Structure Plan.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.32.1 See the Introduction to this chapter. Although I am concerned about the classification of settlements and have dealt with this at Policy HS02 and HS03 I see no reason to change paragraph 3.30 other than by the modification proposed.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify paragraph in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 39

3.33 PARAGRAPH 3.30a VILLAGES

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.30a Pre-Inquiry Change 40

Amend Policy to read: 'Policy HS02 seeks to provide guidance on small windfall sites that come forward during the Plan period. In addition a number of proposed allocations **have been put forward** ~~are proposed~~ for residential development **which** ~~that~~ is covered by Policy HS09.'

The Objections

None

3.34 POLICY HS02 VILLAGES

The Objections

See Appendix 2 at the end of this chapter for details of objections

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Policy HS02 Pre-Inquiry Change 41

Amend Policy to read: 'New housing development in villages will take the form of infilling (1-3 ~~houses~~ **dwelling(s)**) **within** the Built-Up Area **Boundary**, although it is accepted that small groups of up to 5 dwellings within the larger villages* with a range of services and facilities may also be appropriate **within** the Built-Up Area **Boundary** providing that there is no adverse impact on: -

3rd bullet point

- landscape characteristics, particularly **in** Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas;

*The larger villages are defined ~~in paragraph 3.39 as~~ * **and** ** **villages listed in policy HS03**

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Village Policy

- 3.34.1 Policy HS02 seeks to provide guidance on small windfall sites. A number of allocations are proposed for residential development and are specifically covered in Policy HS09. It is logical to list those settlements which are to be defined as villages and which have a BUAB. However, I find the identification of some villages in Policy HS03 with* and ** confusing for two reasons. Firstly, there seems little difference between * and ** villages in terms of what development would be

acceptable, and secondly, the categorisation does not have any relationship with allocations in Policy HS09. A number of non-asterisk villages have allocations, whereas some of those with an asterisk do not.

- 3.34.2 I believe the policy should clearly identify different types of settlements. There are a number of ways this could be done and I am not suggesting that one way is better than another, but with the sequential approach to development, a complex categorisation is not required.
- 3.34.3 One simple way would be to list those larger villages which are considered sustainable, or close to sustainability, where it would be appropriate to allocate land and/or accept more than infilling. Although I am not concerned about the criteria listed in the bullet points of Policy HS02 I see no justification to restrict development to 5 dwellings as mentioned in the first paragraph of the policy. This merely encourages applications for low-density development, and in a sustainable village a restriction solely in terms of numbers would be a contradiction. Other smaller villages listed would be restricted to infilling.
- 3.34.4 If there are smaller villages which are considered by the Council to warrant an allocation these would have to be separately justified. I comment further on the appropriateness of allocations in a number of villages when dealing with individual objections, either in respect of omission sites, or where a revision to the BUAB is proposed.
- 3.34.5 This leads conveniently on to the Council's approach to changing BUAB's. I can understand the problem and practical difficulties for a Council with limited staff resources trying to identify small changes to a BUAB prior to an application being submitted, and relying on development occurring before changing the boundary. However, in my view this should not be the approach taken when an objection is lodged. In considering an objection the merits of inclusion should be fully considered and the boundary changed to accommodate land, even if this does not lead to early development. This is the approach I have taken in my consideration of objection sites involving a change to a BUAB elsewhere in my report.

- 3.34.6 Objectors have expressed concern that the village plans are not up to date. From my visits to many villages I conclude that the BUAB's are generally defensible on the ground and without good reason there is no need to change them.
- 3.34.7 I have not dealt with objections to specific sites here as neither policy relates to the inclusion of such sites. They have been dealt with elsewhere as they occur in the plan. I merely comment here that a number of objections to include land within a BUAB in the smaller and medium size villages would involve development of considerable scale equal to and above the scale of an allocation. Because of this some proposed BUAB changes have been also been dealt with as omission sites.
- 3.34.8 If my recommendation on rewriting Policies HS02 and HS03 are accepted by the Council parts of the supporting text and the definitions, such as "Group" and the term "dwellings" instead of "houses" in the policy would need to be revised.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by simplifying the two policies HS02 and HS03, together with the supporting text as necessary, in accordance with my report above. Do not modify in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 41

3.35 PARAGRAPH 3.31 VILLAGES

The Objections

2017 Royal Agricultural Benevolent Institution

Object on the grounds that this is too restrictive. Restricting development in such smaller settlements often means that such areas unable to develop in a sustainable way.

2097 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

6075 Mr S Waller/Carpenter Planning Consultants

The use of Supplementary Planning Guidance in defining Built Up Area Boundaries is appropriate because this system incorporates a degree of flexibility. This system allows for modification of boundaries in response to any Village Design Statement which may be drawn up and approved. Conversely the incorporation of the BUAB's into the Local Plan would result in the boundaries being fixed and inflexible. Would argue that village boundaries should be reviewed on an ongoing basis and that SPG provides the best framework for this to take place.

7098 Mr A E Watts/Whymark & Moulton

Land at The Common/Lower Road, Lavenham. This disused and overgrown area of land adds nothing to the appearance of this part of Lavenham. The site should not be excluded from the proposed built-up area boundary for Lavenham. A small-scale residential development of 5-8 dwellings incorporating the required highway improvements with a significant landscaping scheme, would be a marked improvement for the community.

7106 Melford Place Farms/Whymark & Moulton

Land to the South of the former Railway Line. East side of Station Road, Long Melford. The built-up area boundary excludes the above land which was an allocated with in the Babergh Local Plan, First Deposit Plan. The site is suitable for development although the scale of such development has yet to be determined. The built up area should not exclude all development on this site.

9411 Mr H Bunbury

The present boundary is defined by domestic curtilages, rather than by the physical from, although it is not clear from the policy why this should be so. Suggests extension of the Built Up Area Boundary to include his property. The site is excluded from the present Built Up Area Boundary despite containing a building of reasonable size, which defines the street frontage within the Conservation Area. Its loss would be detrimental. In respect of para 3.31 would like to see the boundary revised and updated to include the area indicated.

9414 Mr H Bunbury

In respect of paragraph 3.31 I wish to propose a revision to the Built Up Area Boundary for Monks Eleigh, to include the area indicated overleaf (see rep).

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Paragraph 3.31 Pre-Inquiry Change 42

Amend paragraph to read: 'In 1995 the District Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for all villages in the Babergh District. This defined the Built Up Area Boundary (BUABs) for Villages. Following representations from Go-East at the First Deposit Draft **consultation** stage, the BUABs have been incorporated in this **P**lan. A consultation exercise with Town/ Parish Councils/ Meetings in 2002 has enabled ~~the District Council~~ to make **some minor** more revisions and updates **ing** to the boundaries. Policy HS03 **identifies those** ~~defines~~ settlements that which are classified as Villages, **while** ~~and~~ their defined **BUABs** boundaries are shown on the Proposals Map. For clarity, the defined BUAB is the inside edge of the line as shown on that **Proposals** Map.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.35.1 Although I have suggested modification of Policies HS02 and HS03 I accept there needs to be a difference in approach to development in the larger and smaller villages on the basis of government guidance on sustainability.
- 3.35.2 Built Up Area Boundaries are a fundamental part of planning policy and government advice makes it clear they should not be relegated to Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- 3.35.3 Objections to specific sites are not related to paragraph 3.31 and I have not dealt with them here.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify paragraph in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 42

3.36 PARAGRAPH 3.31a VILLAGES

B.D.C. is proposing new Paragraph 3.31a Pre-Inquiry Change 43

In addition to identifying the extent to which a settlement can be developed, other considerations need to be taken into account. The purpose of BUABs is to:

- Protect the open countryside, and in particular areas of high landscape value
- Strengthen and complement Conservation Area boundaries and policies
- Protect important trees, vegetation and biodiversity
- Protect important archaeological features
- Protect important open spaces and recreational areas within and immediately without the defined boundary
- Avoid coalescence of adjoining settlements
- Accommodate changes in development within settlements
- Identify a logical and defensible boundary that retains a relatively compact settlement form

The Objections

None

3.37 PARAGRAPH 3.31b VILLAGES

B.D.C. is proposing new Paragraph 3.31b Pre-Inquiry Change 44

Important open spaces, and areas of visual or recreational value are identified in Villages in the context of the Built Up Area Boundaries. These locations are referred to as Areas of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity (AVRA) and are found on the Proposals Map for Villages listed in Policy HS03. Like the BUABs, AVRAs were introduced in the 1995 Supplementary Planning Guidance for villages in the District and have been incorporated in this Plan. Policy EN04, (see Chapter 7 : The Built Environment and Conservation), seeks to protect important open spaces in settlements, and refers to the protection of AVRAs. However, there are other locations not identified as AVRA, and which are also protected by the policy.

The Objections

None

3.38 PARAGRAPH 3.31c VILLAGES

B.D.C. is proposing new Paragraph 3.31c Pre-Inquiry Change 45

AVRAs complement and strengthen policies that protect open spaces and the setting of buildings from development, including those relating to BUABs. They can protect and/or retain:

- **Trees, woodlands and other natural areas or features;**
- **Sports facilities, playing fields, play areas, allotments and open spaces or other recreational facilities;**
- **Important visual gaps in the street scene;**
- **Views into and out of the settlement;**
- **Visually important flood plains or other areas surrounding rivers or water features;**
- **The historic form of a settlement;**
- **The setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas;**
- **Visual quality of a settlement;**
- **The Countryside within and without the BUAB;**
- **The historic setting of agricultural buildings;**
- **The setting of Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites;**
- **Visually important approaches to settlements**

The Objections

None

3.39 POLICY HS03 VILLAGES

The Objections

See Appendix 3 at end of this chapter for details of objections

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Policy HS03 Pre-Inquiry Changes 46 and new Built Up Area Boundary Map Pre-Inquiry Change 73

Inclusion of Cockfield (Windsor Green) in list and new map

In penultimate line

** denote villages with a range of services but falling short on at least one of the above.

The Objections

13213 L A Cornell & Son

Inclusion of Abbey Lane Windsor Green within BUAB. Consider site an opportunity for development to maintain a balance for smaller homes in Windsor Green. Easy access to the bus route on the A1141 for Bury St Edmunds and Sudbury, with both towns having good railway connections. In walking distance to village school, shop, and church to enable the area to develop with a balanced community.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.39.1 See my report at Policy HS02 above regarding the approach to village policy and categorisation. I have recommended that both Policy HS02 and HS03 be revised. Built Up Area Boundaries were only added at the 2ND Deposit Draft stage. I have dealt with proposals for change to BUAB's on their own merits throughout this chapter.
- 3.39.2 A number of the above objections have been duplicated elsewhere as omission sites and changes to built up areas boundaries. I have not dealt with them here.
- 3.39.3 Wherstead village is not listed in Policy HS03. That part of Wherstead parish within the Bourne Hill and Strand area is included as part of the town. I agree that this could be made clear by adding to paragraph 3.27 third bullet point "including Wherstead Bourne Hill and The Strand"
- 3.39.4 I have dealt with the BSC site in the Employment Chapter of the Plan.
- 3.39.5 Allocated site HS090 at Long Melford has been deleted from the Plan.

- 3.39.6 Cockfield - Although from my visit I do not consider Abbey Lane to be suitable for development, as on the basis of government advice on densities it would enable up to 12 dwellings to be built in a non sustainable village, I have commented on minor development possibilities for Windsor Green, Cockfield elsewhere in my report when dealing with the Built Up Area Boundary for the settlement.
- 3.39.7 I have dealt with Objection 8441, which is a conditional withdrawal, at Policy EM02e in the Employment Chapter

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan by

- a) adding to the third bullet point of paragraph 3.27 **including Wherstead Bourne Hill and The Strand**
 - b) See my recommendation at HS02 above
-

3.40 PARAGRAPH 3.32 VILLAGES

The Objections

253 Mr and Mrs M E Read

Objection relates to the deletion of former policy LP7 in combination with the omission of the settlement boundaries from the development plan.

849 Mr R J Prosser

The village Planning Policy Guidelines, including plans of built-up area boundaries should be included in the Local Plan.

2098 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Par 3.15 makes an over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings

included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.40.1 Following advice from GO-East Built Up Area Boundaries have been included in the plan. Paragraph 3.31 which referred to Supplementary Planning Guidance has been deleted.
- 3.40.2 I have dealt with the adequacy of housing land to meet Structure Plan requirements in the Introduction to this chapter of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.41 PARAGRAPH 3.33 VILLAGES

The Objections

254 Mr and Mrs M E Read

Object to the omission of the settlement boundaries from the plan. Urge the Council to review the Built-Up Area Boundaries now and include them in the Plan.

356 Redbourne Ltd/Earl and Lawrence

To assist in identifying other sites for housing development, some indication of the possible changes to village boundaries should now be considered rather than after the adoption of the Local Plan alterations.

850 Mr R J Prosser

A period of 10 years is too long between reviews of the settlement boundaries. The Council should carry out the overdue settlement boundary review prior to the Second Deposit Stage and hence provide a comprehensive and up to date overall document. Cross hatching has no stated purpose in relation to village boundaries.

1753 Exors C Easterbrook/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

1760 Lady Bristol/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

1767 Tendring Hall Estate/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

To assist in identifying other sites for housing development, some indication of the possible changes to village boundaries should now be considered rather than after the adoption of the Local Plan Alterations.

1812 Tarmac Southern Ltd/First City Ltd

Broadly support the proposed settlement strategy and sequential approach set out in par 3.1 - par 3.33.

2099 Bovis Homes Limited

The plan does not allocate adequate housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.

This objection is based on the assumption made in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan that windfall sites will provide for 1,800 dwellings between 1996 and 2016.

In particular, Table 1 of Paragraph 3.15 makes an unjustified over reliance on unidentified windfall sites which currently account for 26% of the total proposed provision for the District.

No information is given to support this figure of 1,800 dwellings and if there is any uncertainty about this number of dwellings coming forward, additional allocations are needed to deliver the adopted Structure Plan housing requirements.

The housing land supply information currently requires further clarification and analysis to support the numbers of dwellings included in Table 1. It appears that the proposed provision of windfall sites has been over-estimated and that the new Local Plan allocations are required to meet this shortfall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.41.1 Paragraph 3.33 has been deleted because it referred to Supplementary Planning Guidance defining village boundaries. On advice of GO-East appropriate villages now have Built Up Area Boundaries. I understood from Inquiry and written evidence that the boundaries have been subject to consultation with Parish Council's which have suggested changes, a number of which have been incorporated into the Plans. Some BUAB maps contain other information but the village boundaries are clearly defined. Minor drafting errors in Plans will be put right before adoption. See the Introduction to this chapter for my report on adequacy of housing supply.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42 BUILT UP AREA BOUNDARIES FOR VILLAGES AND AVRA DESIGNATIONS

3.42.1 ACTON

The Objections

8511 Mr S W Cobbald/Crawford Smith Chartered Surveyors

We propose that the Built Up Area Boundary should be extended to include the area of land south of Tamage Road and east of Sudbury Road.

8513-8514 Mr P A Cobbald/Crawford Smith Chartered Surveyors

We propose that the envelope should be extended to include the area of land known as 'Vicarage Field' and shown edged red on attached plan. (See rep).

Propose that the Built Up Area Boundary be extended to include client's land. It is situated on the western side of the village and is within a short commute to the centre of Sudbury. The site therefore provides excellent access to the main road and rail links as well as the major employment centres of the town.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.1.1 The land south of Tamage Road is large and under government guidance on densities could accommodate at least 117 dwellings. This would be a massive expansion of this village which is not shown to be sustainable under Policy HS03 as it lacks a number of services and facilities. The size of the development would be of a scale which would more appropriately be considered as a strategic allocation. See also the Introduction to this chapter on housing land requirements.
- 3.42.1.2 The inclusion of a large open site within a BUAB would be illogical and would merely invite a form of development out of scale with the village and an intrusion into the countryside.
- 3.42.1.3 The site which forms part of Vicarage Field reads as an integral part of the countryside. The present boundary running along the rear gardens of the ribbon of dwellings is defensible. It is suggested that those occupying the dwellings could readily commute but one of the planks of government and the Council's policy is to discourage the use of the private car for commuting. That is why allocations are mainly in towns and larger villages which are already well served by a range of facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.2 ASSINGTON

The Objections

4511 Mr L J Hogger

Objection to current village boundary. Objector would like to see it revised so that it includes land outside the boundary, which could then be used for housing developments, in particular a 4 bedroom family house.

7052 Mr J Bradshaw/Whymark & Moulton

Part of the property is designated as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity. This is currently used as a private garden and has a well-developed mature frontage hedge to the highway. This hedge prevents any views of the garden or fields beyond. The designation prevents the owner's full enjoyment of the property as the policy wording would not permit any development which could include outbuildings or other structures incidental to their enjoyment. It is understood that AVRAs are not covered by any policy and therefore have no status.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.2.1 The land in Barracks Road is isolated from the village by open agricultural land. It is not visually or physically an integral part of the village. It would be illogical to include such a site within a BUAB without including land which separates it from the village. This is a small unsustainable settlement where such expansion would not be justified.

3.42.2.2 This is a private enclosed garden which I found has little relationship to the countryside beyond. It is separated from the countryside to the south by the dwelling and there is development to the north. I do not consider this small site justifies designation as an Area of Visual Amenity.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Area of Visual Amenity and /or Recreational Amenity designation from the site

3.42.3 BILDESTON

7040 Mrs P Sewell/Whymark & Moulton

The Built Up Area Boundary map for Bildeston indicates the entire curtilage of 21, High Street as being an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity. The house is located approximately in the centre of the plot with a detached garage to the north. There is a large mature tree between the house and road frontage, which is a dominant feature in the street scene. The objection is based on the fact that the area identified is not visible from the public highway as there is a boundary wall to the full length of the road frontage, between 2.1 and metres in height. This wall is located on the back edge of the footpath. The only break is the vehicular access which enters in front of the existing property. The other garden areas are private and have no open aspect from any public view. Therefore this cannot be described as an AVRA. This designation could prevent the owner's full enjoyment of the property. The site is within the designated Conservation Area and therefore the mature tree has statutory protection. It is the tree and the boundary wall which are the dominant features this property presents to the highway and surrounding properties. It is understood that areas designated as AVRA are not covered by any policy and therefore have no status.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.3.1 I consider that the importance of this land is in its setting for the house. This is emphasised by the an important tree in the front which is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. However, the house and its garden are an integral part of the High Street. The site is fenced and its openness is of greater importance to the house itself than to public visual amenity. I consider the designation should be deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Area of Visual Amenity and /or Recreational Amenity designation from the site.

3.42.4 BOXFORD

9021 Mrs J Hynes/Tim Harbord Associates

Objects to inclusion of land within the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity which covers that part of the Built Up Area

Boundary on either side of Boxford Lane. The parcel of land concerned is in separate ownership to the land on either side, which comprise a modern bungalow, Airlee and the grounds to the Old School House, from which it is screened by mature planting. It is the only part of the defined AVRA that is not within the Conservation Area, formal recognition in itself that the land is not as important in visual terms. Although it is included within the AVRA it is as closely associated in visual terms with Airlee as it is with the grounds of the Old School House.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.4.1 This site is within the Built Up Area of the Village but is also shown within a designated Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity. It seems to me that as planning permission has been granted for development on the site that the designation is no longer appropriate as it would not be protecting a significant open area of visual importance.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Area of Visual Amenity and /or Recreational Amenity designation from the site

3.42.5 BRANTHAM

3362 Mr M I Wickens

Objector would like the planning village envelope line to be altered so they can apply for planning permission to build a retirement house for himself on his own property.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.5.1 This site is mainly down to grass and reads as part of the open countryside. It is within the Dodnash Special landscape Area. Any development here would extend the ribbon of housing away from the village. It would not be appropriate to encourage such development by including the site within the BUAB. It seems to me that there is no change to the status of this land. In the past , as now, it would have been subject to countryside policies and not included within a BUAB.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.6 BURSTALL

The Objections

8433 Mrs G J Varmer/Stuart P Reid Planning Services

Objection is made on behalf of the owner to their land being excluded from the Burstall Built Up Area Boundary .

8434 Mrs G J Varmer/Stuart P Reid Planning Services

We accordingly invite the District Council to include the land within the defined Built Up Area Boundary, and to remove the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.6.1 Burstall is a small village with few facilities. Burstall House stands alone to the west of the lane separated from it and other housing by the small field. This is an attractive open area. providing a setting for Burstall House. There is sporadic development only on the west side of Burstall Hall Lane. I do not consider the dwelling and adjacent open land reads as an integral part of the built up area of the village.

3.42.6.2 Although the Council has calculated that the site of 1.25 hectares could accommodate over 37 dwellings, from my visit and having regard to the character of Burstall House and its setting I consider that such a density would be out of keeping with the area. The site is, therefore, too small to be a Local Plan allocation and any proposals to develop would need to be dealt with as a windfall. In my view development here would not be sustainable or be likely to improve the viability and vitality of the village or its services. The BUAB should remain as drawn.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.7 CAPEL ST MARY

The Objections

5473 Mr M Bate

The only residential home in Capel not included in the boundary is the Old Rectory. Objector might want to apply for planning permission for an additional dwelling on the site to accommodate parents. Understand that by being included within the Built Up Area Boundary planning permission would be more easily granted.

6329 Merchant Projects Ltd

Objection to the line of the Built Up Area Boundary for Capel St Mary. Objector would like the plan to be redrawn to include the playing field off Old London Road.

7037 Mr R L Morgan

In Capel St Mary there is no available space inside the present settlement boundary area and any abutting playing field is certain to affect the visual amenity of at least some residents some of whom may find such a change detrimental. An alteration to the settlement boundary is necessary to permit the establishment of a new or extension to an existing playing field.

7081 Mr E C Macadam

Object to brownfield site omission at Castle Farm, Little Wenham previously used for housing, a water tower, briefing sheds and other ancillary activities adjoining the former Raydon Airfield, adjacent but well screened from existing infill housing in Great Wenham and potential areas adjoining Capel St Mary. Object to policy which should be amended to enable a residential housing allocation to be made on a suitable site or sites on Castle Farm adjacent to Capel St Mary sufficient to provide the funds required to enable the long term preservation of the listed buildings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.7.1 Capel St Mary is a reasonably sustainable settlement and with the allocation of more land for employment alongside the A12 could be defined as such once development occurs.
- 3.42.7.2 The Old Rectory is a large well-screened site with a detached dwelling on the higher part of the site, set well back from the road. The land slopes down to the west towards the stream. The surrounding area to the east and west are open and, together with the Old Rectory site, read as part of the countryside and are not well related to the built up area of the village. The inclusion of the Old Rectory within the BUAB could encourage development out of keeping with the form and character of the village. I believe the present village boundary is defensible and should be retained.

- 3.42.7.3 The playing field is already within the Built Up Area Boundary of the village. It is also within an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity which reflects its open playing field use. I have no evidence before me that the playing field needs to be moved or even expanded. The site could accommodate a minimum of 114 dwellings on the basis of government guidance on densities which would involve a large strategic expansion of the village. See also the Introduction to this chapter on housing land needs.
- 3.42.7.4 In my view the proposal for Church Farm is only peripherally concerned with the need for housing in the area. It is a way of providing funds for the restoration of buildings some important historic buildings. Such a scheme is a matter to be negotiated by the Council and not for inclusion in a Local Plan policy. On the basis of government guidance on densities even the smaller area of 2 ha could accommodate about 60 dwellings which would involve a substantial and unacceptable incursion into the countryside. It would be totally illogical to provide a BUAB to enclose sporadic development and open land in the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.8 COCKFIELD - CROSS GREEN

The Objections

8681 K G M Steward/Strutt & Parker

Consider that the defined settlement boundary should be amended to take into account their client's landholdings at Cross Green, Cockfield.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.8.1 Cross Green is a small settlement with few facilities and in accordance with Policies HS02 and HS03 would only be suitable for limited infilling. Under government guidelines on densities the site could accommodate in excess of 10 dwellings, a scale of development which would normally be dealt with on the basis of an

allocation in the Plan. Cross Green is not a sustainable settlement and it would be inappropriate to extend the BUAB to accommodate this scale of development.

- 3.42.8.2 The site is mainly to grass with some farm buildings. It forms an integral part of the rural setting of the village. It should not be included within the BUAB.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

- 3.42.9 COCKFIELD - GREAT GREEN

The Objections

4350 Mr K Rush/Brown & Co

Suggest that the Built Up Area Boundary of Great Green be revised at the eastern end to include client`s site for future housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.9.1 Cockfield Great Green consists of two estates with a straggle of ribbon development to the east. The proposal would extend the ribbon on the south side of the road into the countryside, and to make best use of the site, would need to be developed in depth. This would involve an unacceptable significant intrusion into the countryside and a scale of development inappropriate for this non sustainable village

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

- 3.42.10 COCKFIELD - WINDSOR GREEN

The Objections

6276 Mr L A Cornell;6278 Mr R N Cornell;6280 Mrs M D Cornell

Request for the inclusion of a new village boundary for Windsor Green.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.10.1 A Built Up Area Boundary was included at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage.

RECOMMENDATION

None

3.42.11 EAST BERGHOLT

The Objections

4344 Sir J Barran/Strutt & Parker

Suggests amending the Built Up Area Boundary to include their clients landholding that abuts it.

4348 Sir J Barran/Strutt & Parker

Objects to the designation of the triangle of land at Quintons Road as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity, and suggests that the site could accommodate a small dwelling.

7053 Sir J Barran/Strutt & Parker

Would like the designation of the triangle of land at the junction of Quintons Road and Gaston End as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity to be deleted.

8182 Sir J Barran/Strutt & Parker

We would like the Built Up Area Boundary of East Bergholt to be amended to include our clients land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.11.1 See paragraph 3.96.10 which contains a more detailed report on the village of East Bergholt.
- 3.42.11.2 The triangular site reads as part of the wider area of visual amenity at Quintons Road and is important to the setting of the adjoining houses. Its amenity importance is enhanced by a Tree Preservation Order. Although the site lies within the BUAB I do not consider that its status as part of an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity should be changed.
- 3.42.11.3 The site to the north of Quintons Road could accommodate in excess of 26 dwellings on the basis of government advice on densities. This is a large development for Babergh and could not reasonably be dealt with as an amendment to a BUAB. The site is well related to the village but it is not clear to me how

vehicular access would be gained as no link is shown to the highway. With allocations already made and my recommendations I am satisfied that there will be adequate land for development to meet Structure Plan requirements during the Plan period. Under Annex B of PPG3 – Rural Exception Sites (revised January 2005) reflected in Policy HS06 the Council is able to provide affordable housing by exception.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.12 GLEMSFORD

The Objections

7050 Albion Business Service/Whymark & Moulton

This objection concerns the former railway station site at Lower Road, Glemsford. The owners believe the settlement around the Skates Hill and Lower Road junction warrants inclusion within its own Built Up Area Boundary due to the close proximity of buildings and properties. The area consist of 8 residential properties at the foot of Skates Hill with a further 15 dwellings along Lower Road, between the Skates Hill junction and Avent Factory. There are other residential properties beyond the Avent Factory, and further residential properties to Lower Road in the Cavendish direction. The area also includes building and land around Dantrick Farm and the Avent Factory which is a major source of employment for Glemsford and the area, which has recently seen extension and new buildings more than doubling its earlier size. Due to the close proximity of dwellings, they are in a semi-urban environment and should therefore not be contained by countryside policies, particularly with regard to extensions. In addition, land at the foot of Skates Hill adjacent to the converted station building is not in agricultural production, being part of the former Glemsford Station yard. If the Built Up Area Boundary is established, this particular area could provide allocation for additional small-scale or low-cost housing.

7417 Mr G Game/Januarys Property Consultants

It is submitted that land at Post Office Lane, Glemsford should not be allocated as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity on the Glemsford village map.

B.D.C. is proposing deletion to an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity at Glemsord Pre-Inquiry Change 69

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.12.1 The Lower Road area of Glemsford is not an integral part of the main village and consists of a small isolated settlement in the countryside. It is within the Stour Valley Special Landscape Area where development is strictly controlled. Glemsford itself, as a sustainable village, is able to accommodate additional development in scale with the village without the need to add to development in Lower Road. If the area suggested were included within a Built Up Area Boundary and best use were made of the land in accordance with government guidance on densities the subsequent development would be an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside completely out of scale with the existing housing in the area.
- 3.42.12.2 Part of the area is the site of the former railway station. Although there is a warehouse building on the site being converted to 8 flats the site is remote from the village and housing here would result in an unacceptable addition to sporadic development along the A1092. The site is close to one source of employment but other facilities are in the village proper. There are no sewers near the site and it is partially within the flood plain. From my visit I consider that if housing development is required sites with a better relationship with the form of the existing village can be found. I do not consider it would be appropriate to include this site and adjoining sporadic development within a Built Up Area Boundary to encourage more development.
- 3.42.12.3 The Council has agreed by pre-inquiry change that the Visual Amenity and/or Recreational Amenity Area designation be deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Area of Visual and /or Recreational Amenity in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 69

3.42.13 HARTEST

The Objections

4354 Mr D W Pask/Brown & Co

Suggest revision of the Built up Area Boundary to include agricultural buildings and yard at Place Farm, to accommodate residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.13.1 Hartest is a small village with few facilities and a Built Up Area Boundary within which infilling may be permitted. The site has a good relationship with the village but its development in accordance with government advice on densities would involve housing development out of scale with the village and be more than large enough for an allocation. There is no such requirement for an allocation in a village which is not sustainable. Additional development on any scale should be concentrated in the larger sustainable villages with a wide range of facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.14 HITCHAM

The Objections

5603 Mr M S Munt;6119 Mrs A Chapman;6325 Mr M Chapman

Objection to designation of land at Syers Farm as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity. It no longer has any visual or recreational merit. Objector would welcome further development as long as it is away from the road side due to vehicle emissions.

7568 Squirrel & Sons/Lacy Scott & Knight

The Built Up Area Boundary at Hitcham should be extended to include the houses at Cross Green. Objector would also like full scale public consultation in the forthcoming reviews.

8836 Dr D E Chapman/Mr M Munt

Objection to the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation within the Hitcham Built Up Area Boundary. The objector would like to see this land used for residential and open space purposes, with the possibility of a preservation order to protect the moat and mature trees.

12292 Squirrel & Sons/Lacy Scott & Knight

Existing Built Up Area Boundary should be altered to include site at Lower Farm.

**B.D.C. is proposing deletion of an Area of Visual and/or
Recreational Amenity at Hitcham Pre-Inquiry Change 70**

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.14.1 As planning permission has been granted since the 2nd Deposit Draft the Council agrees that the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation should be deleted.
- 3.42.14.2 Hitcham is a linear village with little development in depth. It is not a sustainable village in that it has few facilities. I found from my visit that the Built Up Area Boundary reflects existing development including recent additions. Cross Green consists of only sporadic development and should not be included. Lower Farm is isolated from the remainder of the ribbon of more tightly knit development to the south. There was no obvious omission of sites that should be included.
- 3.42.14.3 I consider the Council has rightly assessed it to be an area where countryside policies should apply. When reviews occur they are carried out in accordance with the regulations prevailing at the time.
- 3.42.14.4 The development of the site forming objection 12292, which is in two parts separated by existing farm buildings, would involve a significant expansion out of scale with this small village and an extension of ribbon development into the countryside. In a village of this size with few facilities only infilling within the built up area boundary is considered in scale with the settlement.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan by deleting the Area of Visual Amenity and/or Recreational Amenity designation in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 70

3.42.15 HOLBROOK

The Objections

5997 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Amend the Built Up Area Boundary of Holbrook and allocate site east of the B1080 Ipswich Road to provide a mix of housing and public open space.

8217 Mr G H Josselyn/EWS Chartered Surveyors

The Built Up Area Boundary is illogical given the built form of the settlement and should be extended to include land currently excluded from it.

8679 Greenwich Hospital/Strutt & Parker

The Built Up Area Boundary for Holbrook should be revised to include their clients land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.15.1 Holbrook is classified in Policy HS03 as a village with two ** which denotes villages with a range of services but falling short on at least one criterion, which in the case of Holbrook appears to relate to lack of a variety of employment opportunities. (I have recommended a clarification of the classification of villages under Policy HS02).
- 3.42.15.2 5997 - At the northern end of the village, apart from a small enclave of houses, development is concentrated on the west side of the Ipswich Road where most of the facilities are located. The development of this site on the basis of government advice on densities would involve a significant expansion of the village and incursion into the countryside and the setting of the village. It is more than large enough to be considered on the basis for an allocation. To include the site within the BUAB would not create a defensible boundary for the village.
- 3.42.15.3 8217 Rose Cottage Nursery - The objection site is some 0.6ha and now consists of a coppice, which although untidy, gives the site an informal rural appearance. There is clipped thorn hedge to the road frontage with a field entrance access.
- 3.42.15.4 In 1993 the site was proposed for a housing allocation. The Inspector at that time said, among other comments, that development of the frontage, or of the site in depth as a small estate, would urbanise the area further and bearing in mind the adequate allocations, there is no need

to allocate further land with such an undesirable effect. Although planning permission was granted for a dwelling on the site in 1959 I do not believe a permission granted over 40 years ago carries any weight as national guidance for development in rural areas has significantly tightened over the years to better protect the countryside.

3.42.15.5 In so far as allocation is concerned I do not consider the situation has changed. The present proposal is for a change to the BUAB, not an allocation as such, but the only reason for this open land to be included within the boundary of the village would be to encourage development. Although the Council has stated that between 18 to 30 dwellings could be accommodated on the site in accordance with the recommendations of PPG3 Housing, a development at that density would be out of scale and character with the village. However, if the site were included in the BUAB, to make best use of land, I consider it could and should accommodate more than two dwellings.

3.42.15.6 It was made clear at Inquiry that the objector wishes to erect two low impact dwellings on the site. The details of such proposals are not before me. They were the subject of a planning application which has been refused. As far as the Local Plan is concerned, in my view, there is adequate provision for low impact housing to be dealt with as an exception to the prevailing settlement policy. Under Policy HS25 of the emerging Plan, permission may be granted if it can be demonstrated that a significant environmental benefit will result and other criteria listed under paragraph 3.94 of the plan can be met.

3.42.15.7 The objector considers that the provision of two family homes on the objection site would not conflict with Policies HS02 and HS03. There would be no such conflict only if the site were to be included within the BUAB, which would identify it as a suitable site for development. Otherwise the site would be treated as part of the countryside and proposals would be assessed under countryside protection policies in the Plan.

3.42.15.8 On Plan it could be argued that part of the Hunterswood curtilage could be shown within the BUAB. However, on site I found that it is set in large grounds and does not read as part of the built up area of the village on the

eastern side of Ipswich Road. It acts as a transition between the more intense ribbon of development to the south and the openness and rural character of the objection site to the north.

3.42.15.9 Although the objector has commented that the BUAB boundary has been changed since the settlement guidelines in 1983, these changes merely reflect a more logical and defensible rear boundary to existing properties and do not fundamentally alter the impact of development in the countryside

3.42.15.10 8679 - This is a prominent sloping site used for agriculture and an integral part of the open countryside. About a third of the site would be unsuitable for development because of a "cordon sanitaire" around the sewage treatment works which would limit its impact. The highway authority would accept access through the adjoining housing estate but not from Hyams Lane. Development of the site would be prominent in the countryside and particularly from the AONB.

3.42.15.11 The Council has accepted that Holbrook would be an appropriate location to meet local housing need. The village is specifically mentioned in paragraph 3.39 of the supporting text to Policy HS06 as a receptor for affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of specific groups, not just in the village but also for the benefit of adjoining more rural parishes.

3.42.15.12 Although I agree with the objectors that for the reasons I have stated above there is no inherent reason why development should not occur in the village, neither the Parish Council nor the District Council have identified other local requirements which need to be met in the village during the Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.16 HOLTON ST MARY

The Objections

5867-5871 Mrs A M Page

Unlike Charity Field and Church Square whose facilities are much enjoyed and used by the community, the area in question is a private garden bounded by a high fence and is of no amenity to anyone but the owners. The Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation is not necessary and the only reason for it is that 'it maintains open spaces within the village'. The garden is opposite other properties on the edge of the village envelope beyond which is open countryside.

The Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation does not appear to meet any clear criteria laid down in the 'Village Planning Policy Supplementary Guidance for Villages in the Babergh District'.

No one in the village objects to the removal of the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation as borne out by the fact that not a single parishioner objected to the recent planning application.

The Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity designation appears to be in breach of the owners rights over his/her own property.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.16.1 I believe there are two issues here. One whether the Built Up Area Boundary is defensible and whether if so the land within it should be designated as an area of Visual Amenity.
- 3.42.16.2 On the first matter the boundary follows the curtilage of the property and I am satisfied it reasonably defines the limit of the village.
- 3.42.16.3 Turning to the second point I accept that the surrounding countryside should be protected from the impact of development. However, although it adjoins the countryside I did not find that the site had a particular visual relationship to it. It is a private fenced garden with very little visual amenity value to the village or the surrounding countryside.
- 3.42.16.4 It appears from the evidence that one of reasons the site has been designated is to prevent its development for housing. I do not consider this a sufficient reason to designate the site as a visual amenity area as there are other policies in the Plan under which inappropriate development in a non sustainable village can be resisted.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Area of Visual and /or Recreational Amenity designation from land adjoining Old Post Office Cottage.

3.42.17 LAVENHAM

The Objections

5020 Mr J F Tinworth

The Built Up Area Boundary on plan appears to be out of date as there are developments outside of this line. Does this infer that it is build first and then move the boundary or is it just an out of date map?

7100 Mr A E Watts/Whymark & Moulton

Land at The Common/Lower Road, Lavenham. This disused and overgrown area of land adds nothing to the appearance of this part of Lavenham. The site should not be excluded from the Built Up Area Boundary for Lavenham. A small-scale residential development of 5-8 dwellings incorporating the required highway improvements with a significant landscaping scheme, would be a marked improvement for the community.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.17.1 I have dealt with the principle of changing Built Up Area Boundaries earlier in this chapter when I consider village policy. In brief I have accepted that if a windfall development occurs which breaches a village boundary it may be some time before the map is revised. However, where I have received an objection to a specific built up area boundary I have dealt with it on its own merits and either agreed or rejected the change.
- 3.42.17.2 Lavenham is a sustainable village under Policy HS03 where some additional development would be acceptable, if required. Although this area at Lower Road is overgrown and disused it reads as an integral part of the countryside and not as part of the built up area of the village. It is closely related to the Special Landscape Area to the east and an Area of Visual Amenity to the south. I do not consider development of the site could be properly described as "rounding off". It appears from my visit that The Common and Lower Road are busy routes for local traffic and visibility is

restricted. However, although improvements to the highways could be facilitated through development such improvements could also be provided without development if necessary.

- 3.42.17.3 On the basis of government advice on densities this site is large enough for a housing allocation, but I am satisfied that with the Council's proposed allocations and my recommendations an adequate supply of land will be made available during the Plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements.
- 3.42.17.4 If the Council wish to encourage the development of this site as part of a planning and highway gain project in my view this would have to be subject to detailed assessment and negotiation through a windfall proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.18 LAWSHALL - BURY ROAD

The Objections

4352 Mr M Hodge/Brown & Co

Suggest that the Built Up Area Boundary for Bury Road Lawshall be revised to include client's land for future residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.18.1 Although Lawshall (Bury Road) has a built up area boundary this is a settlement with few facilities. Extending the village by including Buggis Farm which does not read as part of the tightly knit village, and making best use of land in accordance with government advice, would involve development out of scale with this small settlement.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.19 LAWSHALL - LAMBS LANE

The Objections

9095 Mr J T Hancock

The site adjoining Lawshall Row extending from the north eastern boundary toward the village centre represents a suitable location for a mixed development. The site is appropriately positioned within the village as it is bordered by residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.19.1 The village is small with few facilities. It is the type of settlement where under Policy HS02 minor infilling might be acceptable within the Built Up Area Boundary. The site proposed to be included could accommodate at least 32 dwellings on the basis of government advice on densities. This is tantamount to an allocation for development which would be out of scale with this small village. See also the Introduction to this chapter where I have reported on housing land requirements during the plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.20 LITTLE WALDINGFIELD

The Objections

4242 Mr J Pipe/King Architects

Suggests extending the Built Up Area Boundary to include all of the curtilage of 1 Haymarket.

9346 Mr and Mrs M E Read

Objection relates to the delineation of the Built Up Area Boundary set out in the Village Boundary Maps for Little Waldingfield in that it does not show Park Farm Bungalow within the built up area boundary.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.20.1 This is a small village with a Built Up Area Boundary where only infilling would be permitted under Policy HS02.

3.42.20.2 There is very little development on the south east side of the road at the northern end of the village. Although it is included within the Built Up Area of the Village the

grassed area of garden of 1 Haymarket reads as part of the countryside and not as an integral part of the village. I believe that the present Built Up Area Boundary is reasonable and defensible.

- 3.42.20.3 This is a proposal to alter the BUAB for the village to include the omission site at Park Farm Bungalow. However, this site is not adjacent to the BUAB, it is separated from it by agricultural land and buildings to the east. To include the omission site would also logically require the inclusion of this adjacent land within the village boundary. I have a recent plan which includes this land, but there is no evidence that there is a specific local need for housing in the village that has to be met during the Plan period by the inclusion of additional land within the village. Also from my visit I consider the access into the site is narrow and tortuous and would be unsuitable to serve additional houses. From the above I consider that if proposals do come forward for the development of this site for housing that the Council would need to deal with them on their own merits as a windfall.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.42.21 LONG MELFORD (SOUTH)

The Objections

5599 Mr C Wright/Lacy Scott & Knight

Object to the proposed Built Up Area Boundary at Long Melford, and suggests that the existing skip depot off Rodbridge Hill should be included within it for housing. Argues that Long Melford is a sustainable village offering extensive employment facilities together with schooling, public transport and shopping. Close at hand is the major town of Sudbury where extensive employment in the commercial and industrial/retail is available. The site may be considered as brownfield from which is operated a busy skip/waste depot. This site and operation is compatible with the established housing scheme at The Maltings and the proposed residential redevelopment of the former Beestons Coach Depot.

7108 Melford Place Farms/Whymark & Moulton

Refers to land to the south of the former railway line, east of Station Road. The Built Up Area Boundary excludes the above land which was an allocation in the Babergh Local Plan First Deposit Draft. The site is suitable for development although the scale of such development has yet to be determined. The Built Up Area Boundary should not exclude all development on this site.

9024 Mrs M MacDonald/Tim Harbord Associates

Amend Built Up Area Boundary as shown in the inset map for Long Melford (South) to include land at Rodbridge Hill.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.21.1 Long Melford is a large settlement with a defined Built Up Area Boundary. The depot site is at the southern end and immediately to the north of the site is the defined settlement boundary.
- 3.42.21.2 I found this to be an unusual site. From Rodbridge Hill the open stretch of land between Ropers Lane and The Malthouse is rural in character. This is because the former allotment land hatched green on the plan attached to the objection evidence has been allowed to become overgrown, a semi natural wildlife habitat with some diversity value, which acts as a buffer between the main road and the skip depot. On the other hand when entering off the main road and travelling south past the former coach depot site, now being developed for housing, the area, including the skip depot, is of urban character and does not relate to the countryside to the west.
- 3.42.21.3 I consider that the gap along Rodbridge Hill should be retained. It is an important visual open space. However, in my view the skip depot site reads as part of the developed area of the settlement and cannot reasonably be considered to be part of the countryside and subject to countryside policies. Although from my visit the depot site did not seem to be intensively used, intensification of use as such would not involve planning permission. If the site were used to its fullest potential there would be considerable detriment to the occupiers of nearby housing. I do not know how long the depot use has been established but assume it to be a brownfield site under Planning Policy Guidance No. 7.

- 3.42.21.4 A skip depot is not a use appropriate to a residential area, with heavy vehicles passing very close to new dwellings. Its replacement with housing would have limited visual impact on the countryside as long as the existing open site to the east remains open and is maintained as a well planted and natural open space. The access is also more suited to smaller vehicles.
- 3.42.21.5 The site could accommodate between 21 and 35 dwellings under government guidance on densities. The site is large enough for an allocation, but I am satisfied that adequate provision has been made for housing in the Sudbury Area during the Plan period and that further allocations are not necessary to meet Structure Plan requirements.
- 3.42.21.6 Also the Employment Land Study (CD42) identified a shortage of employment land in Babergh district, and there is a need to provide land for such development during the whole of the Plan period up to 2016, subject to review and preparation of the Local Development Framework. These sites need to be in sustainable locations close to the larger centres of population. The objection site at the southern end of Long Melford and close to Sudbury is well located for B1 employment use. Prior to considering the future release of this site I believe the Council should assess whether it is required to accommodate B1 uses to serve the Sudbury area during the Plan period.
- 3.42.21.7 I conclude that the site reads as part of the urban area and should be included within the BUAB for Long Melford (South).
- 3.42.21.8 I am unable to determine what its future use should be as I have no detailed evidence before me specifically related to its importance as a B1 employment location.

* * *

- 3.42.21.9 The site at Station Road has a reasonable relationship with the developed area of Long Melford and was considered for inclusion as an allocation at the 1st Deposit Draft stage but deleted from the 2nd Deposit Draft. I accept that the site has potential for development but I have concluded elsewhere that with

the Council's allocations and the recommendations I have made there will be an adequate supply of land to meet Structure Plan requirements during the plan period. I have no detailed evidence before me that the Station Road site is more suitable than others which have been assessed and chosen for allocation. The only reason to include the site within the BUAB would be to accept its development during the Plan period, and there is no such requirement.

3.42.21.10 From my visit I did not find Rodbridge to be an integral part of Long Melford South. However, it is a cluster of fairly tightly knit development and could be readily defined by a Built Up Area Boundary. The settlement is similar in size and has a greater variety of uses than some small hamlets which have defined boundaries. Because of the compact form of the hamlet I do not consider its location within a Special Landscape Area would be prejudiced by its inclusion within a settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan

- a) to include the depot site within the Built Up Area Boundary
 - b) to include Rodbridge within a Built Up Area Boundary
-

3.42.22 MONKS ELEIGH

The Objections

9413 Mr H Bunbury

The present boundary is defined by domestic curtilages, rather than by the physical form, although it is not clear from the policy why this should be so. Suggests extension of the Built Up Area Boundary to include his property. The site is excluded from the present Built Up Area Boundary despite containing a building of reasonable size, which defines the street frontage within the Conservation Area. Its loss would be detrimental.

9416 Mr H Bunbury

Suggests an extension to the Built Up Area Boundary, which respects the scale and pattern of development in this part of the street and is drawn to retain an important element of open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.22.1 Monks Eleigh is a linear village where frontage development is interspersed with large gaps. The two sites are both part of a former nursery which looks as though it has been abandoned for some time. A barn on a shallow building line and derelict greenhouse/polytunnel frame remain. The barn is a prominent building in the village scene. Apart from where the barn stands the site has a good frontage hedge and the land drops away towards the river. It seems to me from my visit that the smaller objection site which contains the barn is an integral part of the village and should be included within the BUAB. Its inclusion would also define a defensible boundary to the village, retain a compact settlement form and accommodate change, as required by CD95, which sets out criteria for a BUAB. If it is developed I agree with the objector that it would have to be in a form that reflects the character of this part of the village.
- 3.42.22.2 Turning to the larger site it extends to about two thirds of the open frontage and includes not only the derelict greenhouse but also open land adjoining. The site is within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area and the conservation area. Even with the hedge along the frontage it provides an openness in the village street. I consider that development of this amount of frontage would have an unacceptable impact on this area of environmental quality and affect its rural character.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan to include the smaller site within the Built Up Area Boundary

3.42.23 NAYLAND

The Objections

8435 Mr J Oakes/Stuart P Reid Planning

This objection is made on behalf of the owner to his land being excluded from the Built Up Area Boundary.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.23.1 Nayland is a reasonably sustainable village and there is no inherent objection to additional housing. The site, which is the corner of an open field, although fairly prominent has a reasonable relationship with the village. On the basis of government advice on densities the Council considers that the site could accommodate 9 to 15 dwellings in line with PPG3 density objectives. The Council has indicated that there is a shortage of smaller units and affordable housing in the larger villages and best use should be made of land.
- 3.42.23.2 Without more detail, including access requirements, it is not possible for me to determine the number of houses the site could accommodate. I have concluded elsewhere that no further allocations are required during the Plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements, and from my visit to the site I believe it would be appropriate to consider the impact of its development on the village on the basis of allocation criteria and not as a change to the BUAB. In my view the present boundary of the village is defensible for planning purposes and the site, being part of an open field, is not an integral part of the built up area of the village.
- 3.42.23.3 If there are local housing requirements which need to be met the Council would have to consider the merits of any windfall proposal. The use of this site for affordable housing could be dealt with as an exception to countryside policies of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.24 NEWTON

The Objections

4898 Mrs F J Wells

Would like land along the A134 either side of Red House Farm to be included in an extended Built Up Area Boundary, and considered for housing development in the future local plan.

5249 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

Notwithstanding the objection to the principle of identifying open space/recreation protection on land outside settlement envelopes,

object to the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity on land at Newton Green which was subject to a duly made objection in the First Deposit Draft of the Local Plan.

6626 Mr R Wilkins

Objection to the designation of part of the side garden as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity. Objector would like the Built Up Area Boundary to be redrawn and a Tree Preservation Order to be considered for the boundary trees.

6727 M D Mills & M J Oliver/Whymark & Moulton

Objection to the Built Up Area Boundary of Newton. Says it should include all developed areas of the village, and specifically the existing builders yard.

B.D.C. is proposing a deletion to an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity at Newton Pre-Inquiry Change 71

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.24.1 Newton is a small linear village with few facilities.
- 3.42.24.2 The site opposite the public house forms a gap between two ribbons of development on the north side of Sudbury Road. It is the only significant physical and visual break in an otherwise built up frontage. On the basis of government advice on densities the site could accommodate between 10 and 12 dwellings, development out of scale with the infilling which would normally be permitted in a non sustainable village under Policy HS02. The site has at present no visual or recreational amenity value. In my view it is its openness which is important, rather than its visual amenity value. I consider this to be border line but on balance recommend the AVLA designation be deleted.
- 3.42.24.3 Village development is restricted mainly to the north side of Sudbury Road apart from sporadic development near the public house. This site on the south side of the road at the western end of the village reads as an integral part of the open countryside and the setting of the village. Like the site below it could accommodate between 120 and 150 dwellings on the basis of government advice on densities, a scale of development

completely out of character with the form of the settlement.

- 3.42.24.4 The builders yard and agricultural land to the north of Newton is vast and could accommodate between 230 to 380 dwellings on the basis of government advice on densities. Such development would be totally out of scale with this small settlement and an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Its scale would be of strategic importance to the district and the county. No such development is required to meet Structure Plan requirements for housing during the Plan period.
- 3.42.24.5 The Council has agreed to the deletion of the AVRA designation at Hills Barn. I agree with this deletion as the Council now accepts in its evidence on Topic Paper: Built Up Area Boundaries and Areas of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity (CD/95) that the reasons in Appendix 1, paragraphs 3.31, 3.31a, 3.31b and 3.31c do not support the designation. I have dealt with more general concerns about AVRA designations elsewhere in the Plan.
- 3.42.24.6 The function of the BUAB is to define the edge of settlement for planning purposes. The above mentioned Topic Paper at paragraph 7.2 explains the approach taken by the Council. The boundaries are largely historical and traditional, and have been broadly based on a consensus with local communities.
- 3.42.24.7 From my visit to the objection site at Hills Barn I consider the western boundary of the site clearly defines the boundary of Hills Barn and separates the curtilage of that dwelling from open countryside beyond. Also, although laid out as a tennis court the land reads as an integral part of the setting of the house and annex. This contrasts with the open garden land to the rear which acts as a transition between the more formal garden area and the countryside.
- 3.42.24.8 It seems to me that the only two criteria in paragraph 3.31a of Appendix 1 of the Topic Paper having particular relevance to the objection site are the:
a) protection of important open spaces and recreational areas within and immediately without the defined boundary, and

b) identification of a logical and defensible boundary that retains a relatively compact settlement form.

3.42.24.9 With regard to a) the Council has accepted that the AVRA designation was not appropriate and in my view the site has no public significance as an open space, it is clearly part of an enclosed side garden to the house. I have dealt with b) briefly above but reiterate that the western boundary would be as defensible and be more a logical boundary than that shown on the Inset Map for Newton. The change would have not have an impact on whatever *compact* form of the village has.

3.42.24.10 As the function of the BUAB is to define the edge of settlements for planning purposes, I accept the Council's view that the change in boundary may lead to a proposal for a further dwelling on the site. However, although I do not consider there would be a material impact on the countryside from such a proposal, it would be for the Council to assess at the planning application stage the effect of any such development on the setting of Hills Barn.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Inset Map to

- a) include the western part of the garden of Hills Barn within the defined BUAB, and
 - b) delete the AVRA designation from the site opposite the public house.
-

3.42.25 POLSTEAD - CHURCH

The Objections

Mr M R Evans

Objects to the current position of the easternmost section of the Polstead Church Built Up Area Boundary and suggests an extension 25 metres further east.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.25.1 Although I do not share the view of the Council that the impact of 2 or 3 dwellings would be so out of scale with the village it would be unacceptable, in a settlement with few facilities this would

generally take the form of infilling under Policy HS02. This sloping grassland site with tree cover acts as a transition between the village and the countryside beyond and reads as part of the rural setting of the village. This is reflected in its inclusion within the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I consider from my visit that the present Built Up Area Boundary is logical and defensible.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.26 POLSTEAD - WHITESTREET GREEN

The Objections

4454 Mrs J M Kingsbury

Objection to revised village plan with reference to the Built Up Area Boundary around Whitestreet Green, Polstead. Believe that the boundary lies illogically and arbitrarily across Spring Lane omitting Belgic House and the built up area below Spring Cottage. Boundary should be redrawn to include all the built up area of Whitestreet Green, and not just most of it. This would mean that the built up area would be increased, but would provide the possibility of one or two perhaps smaller, infill housing development.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to the Built Up Area Boundary at Polstead Pre-Inquiry Change 72

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.26.1 I share the view of the Objector, as does the Council, that the original boundary did not adequately reflect what is on the ground. Although this is a small settlement with few facilities I agree that the boundary should be changed to incorporate land to enable a defensible boundary to be defined.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 72

3.42.27 SHIMPLING STREET

The Objections

3343 Mr J Massey

The previous Built Up Area Boundary ran at the back of the barn behind the Bush public house. This has now been changed to run at the front of the property excluding all of the public house land.

5998 J.S. Bloor (Sudbury) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Amend the Built Up Area Boundary of Shimpling to include the site east of The Rosary, Slough Hill.

5999 J.S. Bloor (Sudbury) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Delete the Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity in respect of land east of The Rosary, Slough Hill, Shimpling.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.27.1 Although I can understand the Council's concern about the possible loss of village public houses, it seems to me from my visit that the public house and its outbuildings are as much a part of the village as the houses to the east which are included within the BUAB. This relationship was recognised at the 1st Deposit Draft stage.
- 3.42.27.2 If the Council considers that any proposals for redevelopment of the brownfield site should be resisted, either because a local facility would be lost or because the scale would be inappropriate for a non sustainable village, there are policies in the plan which would support a refusal of planning permission.
- 3.42.27.3 As The Rosary has the benefit of planning permission for 5 dwellings there is no longer any reason to exclude it from the BUAB.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by including the public house and The Rosary within the Built Up Area Boundary

3.42.28 SHOTLEY GATE

The Objections

5257 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

Object to the inclusion of an Area of Visual/Recreational Amenity on land east of Bristol Hill and south of Battery Lane, Shotley Gate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.28.1 From my visit I consider this site, although overgrown and in need of some maintenance, is an oasis of growth in an otherwise rather sterile built up area. There are important trees on the site which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. The site makes an important contribution to the townscape and I consider it warrants designation as an Area of Visual Amenity. There may be some limited potential for development on the site but this would have to be subsidiary to its amenity importance.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.29 SPROUGHTON

The Objections

6001 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Amend the Built Up Area Boundary for Sproughton to take into account the proposed allocation at Church Lane, referred to as Policy HS09S in the Second Deposit Draft of the Local Plan.

6809 British Sugar PLC/Gerald Eve

The Proposals Map shows the Built Up Area Boundary and the allocation of Policy EM02c bisecting the former sugar beet factory site at Sproughton. If the boundary line and allocation remain as at present, development of the buildings and operational land to the west of the Built Up Area Boundary line will be contrary to policy thus hindering development of this redundant brownfield site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.29.1 The topic paper on BUAB's (CD95) states that the main purpose of Built Up Area Boundaries is to differentiate between settlements where an appropriate level of development might be allowed, and the surrounding open countryside. It seems to me that once an allocation has been made on a greenfield site in a formally adopted Plan the Council has accepted that the particular site no longer needs to be protected as part of

the countryside. However, until development occurs the site cannot reasonably be described as being a built up part of the village and it could be some years before development takes place. On balance I favour retaining the established BUAB until development has taken place, as the allocation itself makes it clear that development will at some time be permitted.

3.42.29.2 See my report on the Sugar Beet Factory in the Employment Chapter of the Plan

RECOMMENDATION

See my recommendation on the BSC site in the Employment Chapter of the plan

3.42.30 TATTINGSTONE CHURCH

The Objections

6077 Mr S Waller/Carpenter Planning Consultants

Object to the Built Up Area Boundary for Tattingsstone (Church) and wish this to be amended to include the field to the west of Chedworth Place.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.30.1 Tattingsstone (Church) is a small settlement with few facilities where only infilling would be appropriate under Policy HS02. On the basis of government guidance on densities the smaller site could accommodate in excess of 12 dwellings. This is large enough for an allocation. The settlement is not sustainable and development of this scale should be located in larger villages with a wide range of services. This open farmland does not form an integral part of the village and to include it within the Built Up Area Boundary would be contrary to the reasoning behind providing defensible boundaries to villages to protect the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.31 TATTINGSTONE HEATH

The Objections

9476 Mr N Sillett/Gordon Terry Chartered Town Planning Consultant

The Tattingstone Heath Built Up Area Boundary should logically be extended eastwards along Church Road in the direction of the Tattingstone Church Built Up Area Boundary so that the situation on the ground is recognised, by incorporating with Tattingstone Heath the cohesive pattern of existing development here.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.31.1 The proposed site is located at the eastern end of a straggle of development. It is an open site which is a transition between the ribbon of development to the west and the countryside to the east. If put to best use in accordance with government guidance on densities the site could accommodate between 16 and 28 dwellings, although I accept that any density of development would also take into account the character of the area. This site is well outside the Built Up Area Boundary of a hamlet with very few facilities. Development here would be non sustainable and increasing the number of houses commensurate with the scale of the hamlet would be unlikely to achieve any form of sustainability. It would be also contrary to government guidelines which direct new housing other than minor infilling to those villages which already have a range of facilities. With allocations and my recommendations for change I consider there will an adequate supply of land to meet Structure Plan housing requirements during the Plan period. Even if there were not this site would not be appropriate for such an allocation.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.32 WHATFIELD

The Objections

5919 Mr J Chisnall/Peacock Short Property Solutions

Objection to exclusion of client`s land from the Built Up Area Boundary of the village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.32.1 From my visit to this small village I did not find it to be sustainable. Although it has a primary school and some meeting and sports facilities it has no local shops and insignificant job opportunities. The village has limited public transport and residents rely primarily on the car. There are few facilities that can be accessed by walking or cycling.
- 3.42.32.2 Because of this it is not clear to me from the Council's evidence why the Church Farm site has been allocated. It could only be justified on the basis of some local need or justification. I have raised this issue elsewhere in my report.
- 3.42.32.3 The same arguments would apply to this objection site. On the basis of government guidance on densities it could accommodate between 17-28 dwellings. Such development would be out of scale with a small non sustainable village which would generally be restricted to infilling under Policy HS02, or affordable housing to meet specific local needs. No such needs have been identified..

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.33 WHERSTEAD

The Objections

8476 Powergen UK/Plc DTZ Pieda Consulting

Wherstead should be noted as a settlement and added to Policy HS03. A settlement boundary should consequently be added to the plan to include properties within Wherstead village including the Powergen site and the proposed adjacent employment land allocation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.42.33.1 Wherstead is so small that it is an integral part of the countryside and I do not consider it warrants a Built Up Area Boundary. This would encourage infilling where this would not be appropriate. I consider that Wherstead is properly designated as a village in the countryside. The E.On (UK plc) site has been given

particular consideration elsewhere in the Employment Chapter of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.42.34 WOOLVERSTONE

The Objections

9063 Mr A Double

The Built Up Area Boundary should be amended to include that part of the existing nursery business for residential and employment purposes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.42.34.1 Woolverstone is a small village with few facilities. The form of the village is linear with little development in depth. Because of its size housing would be limited to infilling under Policy HS02.
- 3.42.34.2 The site is enclosed and well related to the village but it is within an AONB where development is strictly controlled. Under government guidance on densities the site could accommodate between 21 and 35 dwellings To include it within the Built Up Area Boundary of the village would encourage development of a scale inappropriate for a small unsustainable village.
- 3.42.34.3 I have no evidence of identifiable local needs for housing or employment which have to be met in this village

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.43 PARAGRAPH 3.35 COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL

The Objections

2021 Royal Agricultural Benevolent Institution

Object on the grounds that this is too restrictive. Restricting development in such smaller settlements often means that such areas are unable to develop in a sustainable way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.43.1 This paragraph merely reflects government policy to restrict development in the countryside. I accept that certain local needs may have to be accommodated in smaller villages but these would be dealt with as an exception to strict countryside policy. In my view very few small villages can expand to such an extent that they improve their sustainability. As I have said when dealing with Policies HS02 and HS03 if there is a particular reason why a smaller village should expand to meet local need this should be spelt out in the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.44 POLICY HS04 COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL

The Objections

1432 Mrs M R Leeson

I support the protecting of the countryside, but feel that this policy should provide improved biodiversity, aesthetic quality and cultural heritage.

2019 Royal Agricultural Benevolent Institution

Object on the grounds that this is too restrictive. Restricting development in such smaller settlements often means that such areas are unable to develop in a sustainable way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.44.1 The Plan should be read as a whole and I consider the more detailed protection of the countryside and its biodiversity are adequately dealt with in the Environment Chapter.

3.44.2 In my view very few small villages can expand to such an extent that they improve their sustainability. As I have said when dealing with Policies HS02 and HS03, which I have recommended should be simplified, if

there is a particular reason why a smaller village should expand to meet local need this should be spelt out in the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.45 PARAGRAPH 3.36a REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

3746 Mr A Cotton

Some wording is internally inconsistent or unnecessarily restrictive on development that would enhance, rather than harm the countryside environment. For instance by replacing energy inefficient and mediocre dwellings from the 1950's, 60s and 70s with houses complying with, or even exceeding the exacting standards now set in terms of energy efficiency and design.

3747 Mr A Cotton

The wording of the first sentence might be construed as ONLY allowing replacement of old or substandard properties.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.45.1 This is a fairly standard statement about the scale and form of replacement buildings to avoid unacceptable impact on the countryside. Policy HS05 lists the more detailed criteria which need to be met. They would not preclude energy efficient dwellings. This policy and the supporting text are only concerned with replacement dwellings on a one for one basis not other forms of redevelopment in the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.46 PARAGRAPH 3.36b REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

The Objections

3754 Mr A Cotton

Para. 3.36b wording of the second sentence provides a definition for the expression 'significant enlargement' and the expression 'significantly different' is used with what is apparently a different meaning.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.46.1 Paragraph 3.36b explains what it considers to be significant enlargement. I do not consider there is conflict between this and the first bullet point of the policy.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.47 POLICY HS05 REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

3752 Mr A Cotton

Whilst I support the general intent of the policy, I object to the amendments made since the first deposit draft as some wording is internally inconsistent or unnecessarily restrictive on development, that would enhance, rather than harm the countryside environment.

3753 Mr A Cotton Conditional Withdrawal

The reference to 'design' in the first bullet point is misplaced.

3755 Mr A Cotton

I do not see why the 50% guideline should be removed, given the other constraints of policy HS05 and the additional clarification now provided by paragraph 3.36b. . .

7490 Mr M R Wincer

It would appear that under clause 3.36b it is possible to provide for a significant increase in floor area ie. 30-35% in certain instances. This is not mentioned in HS05 and clarification is required in Policy terms.

7491 Mr M R Wincer

The special instances relate where the existing property is small but over 75sqm or where the extent of the site would enable a larger property "to be in proportion". No explanation provided as to what "in proportion" is defined as.

9078 Cockfield Parish Council

Objector does not agree with condition added by Babergh District Council: the replacement of two or more small dwellings with one larger one, will not be permitted, even if all the above criteria have been met.

B.D.C. is proposing a change to Policy HS05 Pre-Inquiry Change 47

Amend as follows: 'Outside the built-up areas of Towns and Villages planning permission may be granted to replace a dwelling and ancillary outbuildings on or very close to the same site if:

- the size, ~~design~~ and massing of the replacement is not significantly different to those of the original dwelling to be replaced;'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.47.1 It seems to me that the criteria listed in the policy would ensure that replacement dwellings are appropriate to their rural surroundings.
- 3.47.2 The reference to "design" is misplaced. This has been put right by Pre-Inquiry Change (Set 2) 47
- 3.47.3 Although I do not generally favour percentages in policies involving the size of dwellings because they are arbitrary I see no reason not to include them for guidance in the supporting text, as they give an indication of the scale of increase likely to be accepted.
- 3.47.4 The first bullet point of the policy adequately reflects the supporting text by mentioning "significantly different"
- 3.47.5 It seems to me that paragraph 3.36b merely identifies the possibility of a larger dwelling than the one it replaces. The acceptance or otherwise of a larger dwelling would depend upon the circumstances of the case which could only be determined at the planning application stage.
- 3.47.6 As the housing needs surveys have confirmed a shortage of smaller dwellings in rural areas, I believe the requirement is reasonable. I doubt that that there are many occasions where this requirement is likely to cause conflict.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 47