

## **11. Chapter 11 – Hadleigh Town Centre**

### 11.1 PARAGRAPH 11.1 – 11.2 INTRODUCTION

#### **The Objections**

##### **1633-1634 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Text should include a reference to the significant need to accommodate a larger foodstore proposal to address some of the needs and concerns expressed in the text. Reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.1.1 In my view these two introductory paragraphs do not need to contain specific references to a large food store. Paragraph 11.2 accepts that retail uses should be allowed to flourish and the Council has now introduced a specific policy for the Brett Works site.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.2 PARAGRAPH 11.3 INTRODUCTION

#### **The Objections**

##### **925 The Hadleigh Society**

The phraseology is based on a false premise that Hadleigh shows the signs of failing as a shopping centre, despite evidence of the Health checks and obvious prosperity. The wishes of elected members should be reflected, which are against having a supermarket for rather wider reasons than purely commerce. If indeed Hadleigh were failing commercially, then supermarkets would not be interested in building in or adjacent to the town. The suggestion that Hadleigh town is vulnerable and its vitality and viability are under threat is not based on facts or observation. It should be reflected that at the recent Public Inquiry, the proposers were unable to cite any instance where the claimed beneficial effects of an in centre or close to centre actually helped or improve the local economy or business turnover.

##### **1635 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Text should include a reference to the significant need to accommodate a larger foodstore proposal to address some of the

needs and concerns expressed in the text. Reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.2.1 This paragraph merely describes the limits of the shopping catchment area based on the Retail Capacity Study and the vulnerability of the town to outward shopping trips. The principle of the acceptability of a supermarket in the town was determined by the First Secretary of State at the Public Inquiry into the Section 78 case referred to above.

11.2.2 The Council has now introduced a specific policy for the Brett Works site. Mention does not need to be made of it in the Introduction.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

### 11.3 PARAGRAPH 11.4 – 11.5 INTRODUCTION

#### **The Objections**

#### **1636-1637 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Text should include a reference to the significant need to accommodate a larger foodstore proposal to address some of the needs and concerns expressed in the text. Reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.3.1 See my comments above

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.4 PARAGRAPH 11.6 INTRODUCTION

#### **The Objections**

### **17 Mr R Burt**

Existence of an inadequate feeder route of Benton Street that links the town with the A12, London, Colchester, Harwich and Clacton. No initiative is shown in respect to building a relief road to Benton Street. Practical and good ideas have been forwarded but excuses of budget shortages are always forthcoming. Reduce the budgets on departments which embellish (conservation) and transfer such monies to the Health and Safety requirements of the environment particular on footpaths and highways.

### **1638 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Text should include a reference to the significant need to accommodate a larger foodstore proposal to address some of the needs and concerns expressed in the text. Reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.4.1 I have no evidence before me to indicate where a relief road could be built to relieve Benton Street, and if a route were determined whether it could be built during the Plan period. It seems to me from my visits that there are practical and environmental restrictions to both the east and west of the town.
- 11.4.2 This is an introduction paragraph relating to traffic, not new forms of development

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

### 11.5 PARAGRAPH 11.7 INTRODUCTION

## **The Objections**

### **1378 English Heritage**

The statement appears to be unduly negative - new development can be compatible with environmental enhancement. The challenge is often securing high quality design and ensuring modern day usage is compatible with its context.

### **1639 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Text should include a reference to the significant need to accommodate a larger foodstore proposal to address some of the

needs and concerns expressed in the text. Reference could be made to the Secretary of State's recent decision.

**1861 Ipswich & Norwich Co-op Society Ltd/Donaldsons**

Insert "short stay" between "public" and "parking" (objective 4).

**3141-3143 Mr C C Smith**

Objectives for Hadleigh have not explicitly been identified. Before the plan is finalised objectives should be identified for example: Hadleigh will be developed as: a tourist centre, a industrial centre and a dormitory centre for South Ipswich, Sudbury etc.

**9493 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Wording deleted from Objective 3 should be reinstated.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.5.1 As I read this paragraph it refers to a balance of policies. It does not imply that new development would be incompatible with environmental improvement but that often a balance must be struck between competing interests.
- 11.5.2 See my views above regarding a larger foodstore provision
- 11.5.3 I saw from my visits that car parks favour shoppers but from the evidence at Inquiry the objective is also to provide parking for those employed in the centre. This would not be "short stay"
- 11.5.4 I consider the Objectives to be short and concise. The extent of tourism, industry and housing for all needs are assessed through other policies in the plan. They could only be repeated here in general terms and I do not consider it to be necessary.
- 11.5.5 Although I do not feel strongly about the exclusion, in my experience the preservation of the built environment has, of itself, not had direct links with identifiable economic benefits.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

11.6 PARAGRAPH 11.13 SHOPPING

## **The Objections**

### **18 Mr R Burtt**

In 1993, PPG's relating to the Policy 16 of Local Plan 1 stated that a food store in the centre of Hadleigh would harm its vitality and viability. Contradictions are now being made under current PPG guidelines via the recent Tesco Enquiry.

### **1017 Hadleigh Town Council**

The wording of the paragraph claims that large food stores benefit town centres the size of Hadleigh when the on-the-ground experience in similar sized towns disproves this claim.

### **9491 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The deletion of the reference to research should be reinstated.

### **9492 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The newly added reference to PPG6 should be to "Government Guidance" as there are a number of ministerial statements that support and clarify PPG6.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.6.1 Following the Public Inquiry referred to above the First Secretary of State determined in principle that a food store was acceptable in Hadleigh town centre. This was determined in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 6 and other material considerations. Although this PPG has been updated by PPS6 this latest advice continues to support development in town centres over other locations.
- 11.6.2 The general statement about research reflects what is said above in the paragraph about the requirements of PPG6 and I have no strong feelings about its inclusion as it adds little to the principles referred to. It is the advice in PPG6 and ministerial policy which has directed the larger food stores to town centres. However, the final document will need to take into account some of the changes of wording in PPS6 – Planning for Town Centres - which has been introduced since the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft was prepared. This will negate the need to refer to PPG6.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

## 11.7 PARAGRAPH 11.14 SHOPPING

### **The Objections**

#### **19 Mr R Burt;1022&7289 Hadleigh Town Council**

New retail development, under the abysmal parking rules and regulations within Hadleigh's Town Centre, will encourage and not discourage car movements. More car movements and accompanying traffic problems are created in town centres as a result of retail development located within rather than out of town centres (as per the recent Public Inquiry Report). The Buyright location for a new food store will be much more appropriate and fall in line with PPGs once the houses are built beyond on the Aldham Mill Hill. It likely to 'contribute to linked shopping trips.' The majority of people no longer undertake daily trips to shops and as the average supermarket shopping basket is said to be in the region of £60 it is not feasible to carry this home on foot. This is particularly true for Hadleigh where virtually all the homes are uphill for the shopping area. Supermarkets wherever they are situated do not lend themselves to 'linked trips'. They are intended to be one stop shops. Hadleigh's strength is in its good mix of specialist food shops. Pouring more traffic into the town centre will lead to more difficult parking conditions, damage to the environment of the historic High Street and detract from the local shops.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.7.1 Following a major Public Inquiry the location of a larger food store on the Buyright store was firmly rejected by the First Secretary of State as contrary to national guidance, as was the acceptance in principle that a larger food store could be accommodated on the Brett Works site.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

## 11.8 PARAGRAPH 11.15 SHOPPING

### **858 QD-Buyright/Carpenter Planning Consultants**

**1379 English Heritage;1640 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

The paragraph needs to be updated to explain the Secretary of State's decision on the proposals for additional retail floorspace in Hadleigh. A re-assessment of retail policy as it affects Hadleigh is required. Existing Buyright store represents a valuable asset to the town and can be used to further enhance the attractiveness of the town. The Paragraph should refer to the particular needs identified and the benefits arising from further foodstore development to serve Hadleigh. It should also indicate that the inquiry carefully considered alternative sites to meet the various needs and found that the Brett Works and adjoining land was the best opportunity to secure them.

**1023 Hadleigh Town Council;1471 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons**

Delete paragraph as it is no longer relevant.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.8.1 With the pre-inquiry change in respect of the Brett Works and adjoining land paragraph 11.15 is no longer required. It has been deleted. Paragraph 11.15a and 11.15b explain the background.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.9 PARAGRAPH 11.15a SHOPPING

**The Objections**

**6956 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Contains narrative that is inappropriate in a Local Plan.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.9.1 This paragraph provides relevant background material in the supporting text explaining how the need for a larger foodstore in Hadleigh was established. I consider it should remain.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

#### 11.10 PARAGRAPH 11.15b SHOPPING

##### **The Objections**

##### **6953-6954 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Objection is in relation to that part of the "independent consultants Retail Study" commissioned by the District Council which reached the conclusion that there was "...a store of approximately 2500 sq metres" is needed in Hadleigh by way of the provision of a food supermarket by 2006. Our analysis of the Retail Study is that the methodology and conclusions are unreliable. Instead we would propose that the Council consider again the whole basis of the Babergh Retail Capacity Study (2002) with a more thorough, testing, methodology. A further reason for a review is that the study is significantly out of date in relation to the qualitative need issue, following the Government's statement of 10 April 2003 from the ODPM "Parliamentary Statement on Town Centre Planning Policies".

##### **6955 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

There is no paragraph 11.15d in the Deposit Draft Plan, we assume that there is simply a discrepancy in the numbering of the paragraphs and not a paragraph omitted?

##### **9489 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Add the word "consultants" between Council's and Retail in the first line.

##### **9490 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The text included here is only a partial representation from the Retail Capacity Study. It should include the complete picture, as well as the most suitable/favourable site- the Brett Works site, which was also left out.

##### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.10.1 Pre-Inquiry Change 1 has corrected the omission of paragraph 11.15d.
- 11.10.2 The omission of "consultants" appears to be an error?
- 11.10.3 I have considered the Retail Capacity Study and up to date national guidance in PPS6 when dealing with the Brett Works site.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

### 11.11 PARAGRAPH 11.15c SHOPPING

#### **The Objections**

##### **3361 Mrs J E Morgan**

Having followed the pros and cons of all the discussions, I would appreciate the reasons for choice of the Buyright site to be made clear in the Plan such as the environmental and traffic issues.

##### **3454 Mr R B Burtt**

I advocate BUYRIGHTS plan as follows: Sustainable highway access and feeder routes, particularly for large delivery lorries.

##### **3455 Mr R B Burtt**

I advocate BUYRIGHT'S plan as follows: Environmentally acceptable because this site lies outside the designated conservation area.

##### **3456 Mr R B Burtt**

I advocate BUYRIGHT'S plan as follows: Movement noise would be much easier to screen and control.

##### **3457 Mr R B Burtt**

I advocate BUYRIGHT'S plan as follows: No problem regarding existing flood plain.

##### **6952 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Delete paragraph 11.15c HD01a and Superstore proposal (HD01) on Proposals Map.

##### **7662 Sqn Leader J N Bloomfield**

The supporting text of 11.15c does not adequately reflect the reasons why the Council selected the Aldham Mill Hill (Buyright) site.

##### **7856 The Hadleigh Society**

The supporting text of 11.15c appears to have been written before the Council's unanimous decision to allocate the Buyright site for a supermarket and has not been updated to set out the reasons why the Brett Works site is unsuitable.

##### **7857 The Hadleigh Society**

The Buyright site is referred to as being Aldham Mill Hill but it is located on Calais Street.

##### **9479 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The Brett Works site is the suitable location and should be considered the preferable option as identified in the Council's Retail Capacity Study and the States of Secretary decision.

**9480 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Objector unable to see any way in which measures will be able to mitigate the adverse effects the development of a store in this location might have on the town centre.

**9481 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The Local Plan should explain in detail how the measures outlined in HD01a will mitigate the serious effects that will be a result of this development.

**12020 QD-Buyright/Carpenter Planning Consultants**

Objects to the wording contained within the paragraph, "Set against this is the potential for adverse effects on the town centre if a site is developed which does not enable shoppers to link their trips".

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.11.1 The First Secretary of States decision following public inquiry firmly rejected the Buyright site for a larger food store. The Brett Works site was considered acceptable in principle following the same inquiry. Paragraph 11.15c as written has been superseded by Pre-Inquiry Changes (Set 1). It has been substituted by paragraphs 11.15c, 11.15d, 11.15e and 11.15f which relate to the allocation of the Brett Works site. I dealt with a number of objections to that allocation at Inquiry and have reported separately on my findings. The first two sentences of Pre Inquiry Change paragraph 11.15c could be better worded as suggested by GO-East.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Modify the Plan by substituting paragraph 11.15c with Pre Inquiry Change (No 1) paragraph 11.15c text and substitute the following in place of the first two sentences of the paragraph. **To ensure the best location for a new food store in Hadleigh various sites were investigated on a sequential basis. It was considered that no sites within the town centre were of sufficient size. Edge of centre and then out of centre options were examined in line with government and structure plan guidance.**

---

### **11.12 PROPOSED SUPERMARKET – HADLEIGH BRETT WORKS SITE**

**B.D.C is proposing Brett Works as the allocated site for a Supermarket Paragraph 11.15c-e Pre-Inquiry Change 1**

11.15c To ensure that the best location for a new food store in Hadeigh is found various sites were investigated on a sequential basis starting with sites within the town centre and finally other sites. The District Council has examined all options for a new supermarket sites within or adjacent to the town centre in line with government guidance. ~~In the absence of a suitable opportunity in one of these locations, the District Council carefully considered an option away from the town centre and the implications of not providing for a new supermarket in the town. Not providing a site would encourage unsustainable journeys to Ipswich and Sudbury for food shopping. Set against this is the potential for adverse effects on the town centre if a site is developed which does not enable shoppers to link their trips. On balance the District Council believes that a site on Aldham Mill Hill is acceptable subject to appropriate measures to try to mitigate adverse effects on the town centre.~~ **Not providing a site would encourage unsustainable journeys to Ipswich and Sudbury for food shopping. Set against this is the potential for adverse effects on the town centre if a site is developed which does not enable shoppers to link their trips.**

**11.15d The District Council has changed its position on this issue. In the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit Draft version of this Plan no specific allocation was made. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft version an allocation adjacent to the existing Buyright store on Aldham Mill Hill was shown. However, following consideration of representations made on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft Plan, the Council resolved to allocate the Brett Works site between Pound Lane and Bridge Street instead.**

~~11.15e It is therefore necessary that a comprehensive list of measures will be addressed through a Section 106 Agreement for which the developer will have to provide. This will include either financial contributions or improvements/replacements of facilities, which shall be directly related to the proposed retail development.~~ **Locating this proposal on the Brett Works site provides a very close relationship with the town centre to facilitate linked shopping trips. The site of the actual store development and car parking lies partially outside the conservation area and the Brett Works itself is characterised by run down industrial buildings.**

**11.15f The provision of a well designed and landscaped store will improve the setting of the conservation area. A food retail store was previously rejected on this site on the grounds of its design and its access to the High Street. It is**

considered that an access to Bridge Street overcomes these difficulties and the design would be dealt with at planning application stage. The site currently provides accommodation for small businesses and the loss of these should be compensated. There are a variety of other matters which should be provided for directly or through a legal agreement.

**B.D.C is proposing Brett Works as the allocated site for a Supermarket New Policy HD01b Pre-Inquiry Change 2**

Delete policy HD01a and replace it with the following policy:

**"HD01b A site of 3.7 hectares between Pound Lane and Bridge Street, as shown on the proposals map is proposed for a food supermarket of up to 2500sq metres, subject to:**

- **Provision of a well designed scheme which will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the sensitive riverside environment;**
- **Provision of a well designed landscape scheme to be managed in accordance with a Landscape Management Arrangement;**
- **Provision of an access to Bridge Street which minimises the impact on residential property and residential amenity;**
- **Provision of measures to mitigate any loss of residential amenity;**
- **The store including only food and ancillary retail sales, excluding a pharmacy and any other form of service outlet which might undermine the vitality and viability of the High Street;**
- **The environmental improvement of pedestrian links to the High Street, including the improvement and provision of public access to the area north of the churchyard and west of Church Walk;**
- **Provision of the area north of the store development as an area of public open space as shown on the proposals map;**
- **Replacement of any loss arising from access provision to the district council offices car parking, storage facilities and the public allotments;**
- **Provision of a commuted sum for the improvement of public transport to serve the development;**
- **Agreement that the car park be available for use by any member of the public and be managed with the same regime as other car parks in the town;**

- **Provision or funding of measures to promote employment opportunities for the Hadleigh area;**
- **A flood risk assessment being undertaken; and**
- **Provision of information boards at the supermarket site showing the pedestrian and cycle links and promoting the shopping, car parking and tourism opportunities within the town centre."**

### **B.D.C is proposing Brett Works as the allocated site for a Supermarket Inset Map 10a Pre-Inquiry Change 13**

On Inset Map 10a (enlarged) show supermarket allocation at Brett Works site, access via Bridge Street, pedestrian links required and area of public open space (see revised Inset Map 10a for details)

### **The Objections**

**See Appendix at end of chapter for details**

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.12.1 I accept that the site now proposed for allocation is larger than just the Bretts Works and includes Tye Field and Great Meadow. About half of the site, including service area and roads are on meadowland within the Conservation Area. However, for convenience I have called it the Bretts Works site, but have considered below the impact on other land affected by the supermarket proposal.
- 11.12.2 It seems to me that many of the arguments against a supermarket use on the Brett Works site at Inquiry are a repeat of those already dealt with by a previous Inspector and the Secretary of State. As these appeals were dealt with under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the proposal was considered in far more detail than is appropriate for a Local Plan allocation. Objectors should refer to the consideration, analysis and recommendations made at that time as I have not repeated them in any detail in my report, except where I consider there are fundamental differences.
- 11.12.3 Although a number of Objectors prefer the Buyright site the Secretary of State concluded he "agrees with the

Inspector's conclusion that, given the conflict with retail policies and harm to the viability and vitality of the centre, your client's proposals should not be pursued, even in the current absence of an alternative scheme." See CD80A and paragraph 22 of CD80B. There is a current application outstanding on the Brett Works site for a supermarket but again this is not before me.

- 11.12.4 Regardless of all of the objections raised at that time it is clear from the previous Inspector's report and the Secretary of State's decision that a detailed assessment was made of all issues raised. The quantitative, qualitative need, competition, the need to enhance and sustain the attractiveness of the town centre, the impact on the Special Landscape Area and the riverside, the need to reduce travel and reliance on cars, and the enhancement of local employment opportunities. On all of these grounds it was concluded that the proposal was consistent with government objectives.
- 11.12.5 The previous Inspector had the advantage of detailed plans to consider and was able to assess that the bulk of the new food store would be somewhat less than that of the existing principal Brett Works building. Its footprint would be comparable to the existing; the height would be less than the existing, and the ridge lower than that of Sun Court. Also the store and service yard would be set back some 90m from the river and would not impact on the riverside landscape. The Inspector concluded that the location and scale of the store were acceptable on this important site.
- 11.12.6 The approach to the Tesco proposal taken by the previous Inspector was reflected in the Retail Capacity Study commissioned by the Council prior to the second deposit stage of the Plan. See paragraphs 6.30 and 6.31 of that document.
- 11.12.7 I quote from the decision letter of the Secretary of State "... there was a quantitative shortfall of convenience floor space in Hadleigh, as well as qualitative deficiency. It was necessary to overcome these inadequacies, in order to meet policy objectives of less travel, for the sake of better provision for all and in the interest of sustaining the shopping environment in the town centre. A store of the size and associated parking facilities was

*the only viable option* to address the current under-provision of floor space in Hadleigh."

- 11.12.8 I also further quote that the Secretary of State agreed with his Inspector that "the entire residential population of the built up area of Hadleigh would be within 15 minutes walking distance of the new store and within easy cycling reach"
- 11.12.9 In my view there has been no significant change in circumstances or guidance in the replacement of PPG6, (on which the sequential test was based), with PPS6 sufficient to revisit the principle of a supermarket in this location. The proposal would provide for the growth and development of an existing centre and enhance consumer choice in accordance with the government objectives in Chapter 1 of PPS6. It is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition, preserve existing commercial interests or to prevent innovation. The proposal would also be part of a plan led approach, making better use of existing land and buildings, involving redevelopment and extending the centre, thus providing for a range of sites for shopping, in accordance with Chapter 2. I consider that in finally proposing this site for allocation the Council has reflected the importance and reasoning in the Secretary of State's decision and national guidance.
- 11.12.10 The issue of the best location for a food store has been between the Aldham Mill Hill site and the Brett Works site. The former was firmly rejected by the Secretary of State. Proposed Pre Inquiry changes to paragraphs 11.15e and 11.15f encapsulate the reasons why the Brett Works was chosen and why it is preferable to the previously rejected Aldham Mill Site. I see no reason for further detail in the supporting text as no other site options were proposed for assessment against the sequential test.
- 11.12.11 The two outstanding issues of concern to the previous Inspector were the detailed design of the building and the effects of the proposed access to the High Street. Of these, the former is not before me or relevant to a Local Plan allocation. The access now proposed would be from Bridge Street and I deal with this separately later in my report.

- 11.12.12 I have no reason not to accept the figure of 2900sq.m in the retail capacity study (CD40) and the need to provide for that amount of retail space in the centre during the Plan period. However, I believe that the debate about the need for this figure, and whether it should be met on the Brett Works site, or 2555 sq.m on the Brett Works site, and the balance elsewhere in the town, ignores an important point raised by the previous Inspector. That is, the character of this part of Hadleigh and the impact of a large building on the allocation site.
- 11.12.13 The restriction on floor space recommended by the previous Inspector was not based merely on shopping floor space factors, but more particularly to protect the environment as far as possible. This is clear from the wording of the Inspector's report at paragraph 12.2.12 which states "...that anything larger than the proposed store would not be appropriate *within the environmental constraints* of Hadleigh. Anything smaller than that proposed would not give the range or choice ...." These environmental constraints are in my view key factors restricting the scale of development. Whether the balance of floor space between the 2555 sq.m and the 2900 sq.m materialises in the town during the Plan period is difficult to assess, having regard to the tightly knit centre, but regardless of this I do not consider that the figure of 2555 sq.m gross should be exceeded on the Brett Works site. PPS6 does not require the need for additional floorspace to be assessed more than 5 years ahead by which time the Council will be considering Local Development Frameworks under the new legislation.
- 11.12.14 From my visit I consider that the site is "run down" as described by the Council. but even if it were not, the majority of buildings on site, because of their design, materials and appearance, are not inherently pleasing. They are not worthy of retention and contribute nothing to the character of the area, the view across the river or the view down Pound Lane. The site already accommodates large buildings, but it is not their size which is unacceptable, but their appearance. In my view, the site itself can readily accommodate a *substantial replacement building of good design*, regardless of its future use.

## Access

- 11.12.15 I consider there are two issues on access. One is its environmental impact, the other highway safety.
- 11.12.16 Objectors are concerned that once the meadow is breached by a road that this facilitate more commercial development in the future. I do not share this view with regard to the area between the proposed access road and the river. This is an integral part of the setting of the river and the rural setting of the town and should remain in open use. I consider the Council could readily resist building development in this location on sound planning grounds. Although I doubt that there would be a need for as many replacement allotments as shown, and if this is the case there would be opportunity to provide more riverside open space, Fig 5 of the Novell Tullett Landscape Master Plan effectively illustrates how the open areas could be treated and landscaped with an informal link along the river.
- 11.12.17 The land to the east of the new access road and to the rear of properties in the High Street will become more integrated with the town centre and its future will need to be determined by the Council on its own merits. Having regard to the Master Plan I doubt that the area shown as Public Open Space designation on Proposal Map 10a is practicable, in particular the Barn End meadow. The concentration of informal open space should be down by the river, with the allotments close to the road with peripheral planting. I had no detailed evidence from the Council before me at Inquiry about particular public open space needs other than that the supermarket would provide an opportunity to enhance the riverside and public access by extending the riverside walk, and also by mitigating for any negative effects of the development. It is, therefore, difficult for me to make a recommendation other than in general terms
- 11.12.18 Although in the Pre Inquiry Change the new access is only shown with an arrow symbol, from the evidence at Inquiry more detailed options had been considered. Two alternative accesses proposed by Tesco were discussed. From the evidence of the highway authority

and Rutherfords, consultant to the Ipswich and Norwich Co-operative Society I am satisfied that neither of these proposals would produce an acceptable access in highway safety terms.

- 11.12.19 The preferred option of the highway authority would be to demolish the storage building between the Council staff car park ingress and egress to create a new access road. I neither consider the storage building has any inherent merit, nor that access at this point would have a material visual impact in the street scene, taking into account the open car park already established. The access would pass through the allotment site but again I do not believe the visual impact would be significant. What will be important is the treatment of the land severed by the new access road.
- 11.12.20 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was carried out on behalf of the highway authority which recommended solutions to highway problems. This audit dealt with the two alternative accesses proposed by Tesco but did not deal with the scheme preferred by the highway authority. A First Stage Safety Audit regarding the access road preferred by the highway authority was carried out by Boreham Consulting Engineers
- 11.12.21 From my site inspection, although I am of the view that the visibility splay and forward visibility to the east along Bridge Street would not be adequate to serve the development, I also consider that by repositioning street furniture and carrying out other works within the highway that the access can be constructed to overcome the deficiencies identified in the safety audit. As there is a current planning application for a supermarket with the Council, but not before me, I would expect the issue of highway safety to be resolved by the time my report is issued.
- 11.12.22 I consider the wording for the fourth bullet point of HD01b as suggested by the County Council as highway authority is preferable to that written and should be substituted. but the words "to the satisfaction of the highway authority" should not be included. The suggested revision to paragraph 11.15f also has some merit

The River.

- 11.12.23 The Hadleigh and District Angling Society are concerned that the effects of construction work will damage the river bed and quality of fishing for many years to come. This site is badly in need of redevelopment and I would expect the site coverage to be similar regardless of its future use. In my view the impact of construction work would be similar and would not in any event be a reason for refusing permission for development. The wishes of the Angling Society have to be balanced against the need for the site to be redeveloped.
- 11.12.24 This and other aspects of pollution and environmental impacts were taken into account when the previous Inspector and the Secretary of State came to their conclusions on the Tesco planning application in 2001. Reference has been made to the decision of a previous Inspector following an Inquiry in 1993. Details of that scheme are not before me, although I understood that it did not include the Brett Works site and would have involved development on open land, and did not involve redevelopment of a brownfield site.
- 11.12.25 The scale of the building in the present proposal is similar to that agreed in principle following the Inquiry in 2001. The difference between the scale of the scheme at that time and what has been the subject of evidence at this Inquiry I have dealt with above, where I have concluded that the 2555 sq.m figure should not be exceeded.

Flooding

- 11.12.26 It was determined at the last Inquiry that there was no substantiating evidence to refute the basis of establishing the new flood level. The previous Inspector considered that the layout would provide for a reduction of buildings within the flood plain, and provide the necessary measures to alleviate flooding risks to the site and to property elsewhere. Other legislation would ensure that polluted water from the development would not flow into the river.

- 11.12.27 Although the Environment Agency has issued new Flood Maps, the River Brett Flood Risk Assessment Supplementary Report No 1 of January 2004 is the latest assessment information available and I have no evidence before me now which would lead me to disregard the detailed evidence that led to these conclusions. The threat of some flooding is not, of itself, a reason to preclude development on this important part of the urban fabric of Hadleigh. In any event a flood risk assessment would be required, as specified in the policy to indicate how mitigation measures would be carried out for both access options to avoid the obstruction of flood flows and deal with increased surface water run off.
- 11.12.28 The Environment Agency has asked for a sustainable drainage system to deal with surface water and I consider this should be added as a specific requirement to Policy HD01b. Other details of parking and surface treatments are a matter for the planning application stage, not the Local Plan

#### Compulsory Purchase Order

- 11.12.29 I do not accept the argument that if a CPO is mentioned in this policy that it would also need to be mentioned in other policies of the Plan. Planning Policy Statement 6 in paragraph 2.52 requires local planning authorities to consider the scope for effective site assembly using their compulsory purchase powers, *to ensure that suitable sites within or on the edge of centres are brought forward for development*. In this case because of the requirement for an access off Bridge Street, from the evidence before the Inquiry a CPO would at this stage seem to be so likely that it should be stated in the policy to give certainty to those reading the Plan.

#### Church Walk

- 11.12.30 Although from the research carried out by the objectors there would not appear to be a need for additional open space provision in the town, the site fronting Church Walk, if opened up, would make a pleasant addition to public open space. The Town Council and the Hadleigh Society have recognised its potential for some time. However, this is not the issue before me. Under advice

in Circular 1/97 what I am considering is the reasonableness of the policy requirement. To my mind it would be most unreasonable to expect a shopping developer to acquire this site for open space purposes. It has no link to the retail function as such. The Council's concern is one of safety and security, but such matters could be dealt with, without recourse to acquiring the whole site, or perhaps any of the site. Church Walk has houses fronting on to it and I was told that Tesco has agreed to install CCTV and improved lighting. These matters are for negotiation at the application stage.

## Design

- 11.12.31 Concern has been expressed that English Heritage were not given the opportunity to comment of the current Local Plan allocation. This was an oversight and that opportunity was later given. However, regardless of the initial lack of consultation the principle of a supermarket on this site has already been established by a Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State. From the correspondence from English Heritage the design of the store and its impact on the character of the area will be of particular interest but these are also matters which will be of concern to the Council at the detailed application stage. English Heritage are not objecting to the principle of the development. The detailed proposals will no doubt be considered under advice in PPG15.

## RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by incorporating Policy HD01b subject to

- a) adding a further bullet point to require a SuDs drainage system to deal with surface water, and
- b) delete the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet point and the designation of open space on the Proposals Map and substitute **provision of public open space shall be an integral part of the layout of the development**
- c) adding a further bullet point referring to the likely need for a Compulsory Purchase Order.

- d) amending the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read "Provision of a **safe** access....."
  - e) amending the third sentence of paragraph 11.15f by including the words **details of the** design.....
  - f) otherwise modify in accordance with Pre Inquiry Changes paragraph d to f.
- 

## 11.13 POLICY HD01a SHOPPING

### The Objections

**3113 Mr J E Caley;3217 Mrs M J Beaumont;3227 Mr B O Beaumont;3247 Mrs J I Wilson;3257 Mr G J Wilson;3570 Mr A C Palmer;3600 Mrs B Sillitoe;3606 Mr B Harvey;3616 Mr S Sillitoe;3626 Mrs J A Whymark;3636 Mrs S A Wood;3925 Mr P Pearce;4237 Mr R T Cornish;4267 Ms J A Bignell;4288 Mrs Upson;4308 Mr I Bayford;4318 Ms P A Johnson;4908 Mrs P Smith;4920 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4930 Mrs H J Biggs;4940 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7435 Mr B Stacom;7445 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal 7455 Mr T Budd;7465 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal 9343 N W Partridge & Co. Ltd./Conditional Withdrawal**  
Object to site at Boswell Lane as there is a better alternative site at Brett Works. I am very supportive of the proposal for a supermarket on the Brett Works site.

**3114 Mr J E Caley**

I object to a food store being installed at Buyright. Strongly opposed.

**3137 Mr D L Williams;3392 Mr R T Cornish;3433 Ms J A Bignell;3785 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal;4240 Mr R T Cornish;4269 Ms J A Bignell;9344 M W Partridge & Co. Ltd./Conditional Withdrawal;9360 Mr G Gordon**

Objects because concerned it will have an impact on the town centre and take people away from the High Street. Feels the Brett Works site will attract people to the town centre.

**3212 Mrs M J Beaumont;3222 Mr B O Beaumont;3242 Mrs J I Wilson;3252 Mr G J Wilson;3391 Mr R T Cornish;3565 Mr A C Palmer;3595 Mrs B Sillitoe;3605 Mr B Harvey;3611 Mr S Sillitoe;3621 Mrs J A Whymark;3631 Mrs S A Wood;3920 Mr P Pearce;4283 Mrs Upson;4303 Mr I Bayford;4313 Ms P A Johnson;4329 Mr & Mrs V E Skinner;4915 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4925 Mrs H J Biggs**

**4935 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7430 Mr B Stacom;7440 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal 7450 Mr T Budd;7460 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal 7470 Mr W Cole;8658 Mr K W Grimsey;8668 Mrs P I Grimsey 8691 Mrs C A Bell;8701 Mr A H Bell**

The Government Inspector at the Public Inquiry 2002, found the site to be unsuitable for a number of reasons, including the adverse effect that a store in this position could have on the town centre, culminating in the loss of some of the smaller independent High Street shops (14.3.7). Despite the recent modification to the original plan, it would still fall outside the easy walking distance described in PPG6, and linked shopping trips to the High St shops would be unlikely to occur. She concluded that, despite the need for a new food store, the QD/Buyright proposal should not be supported.

**3213&3219 Mrs M J Beaumont;3223&3229 Mr B O Beaumont 3243&3249 Mrs J I Wilson;3253&3259 Mr G J Wilson; 3566&3572 Mr A C Palmer;3596&3602 Mrs B Sillitoe 3612&3618 Mr S Sillitoe;3622&3628 Mrs J A Whymark 3632&3638 Mrs S A Wood;3921 Mr P Pearce;4238 Mr R T Cornish;4284 Mrs Upson;4304 Mr I Bayford;4314 Ms P A Johnson;4330 Mr & Mrs V E Skinner;4916 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4926 Mrs H J Biggs 4936 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7431 Mr B Stacom;7441 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal 7451 Mr T Budd;7461 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal 7471 Mr W Cole;8659 Mr K W Grimsey;8669 Mrs P I Grimsey 8692 Mrs C A Bell;8702 Mr A H Bell**

Objects because feels the Brett Works site has a better location to the town centre. This proposal is contrary to Govt. policy of encouraging supermarkets to be sited as close as possible to town centres, and if not possible to be one in the centre, itself, then follow a 'sequential approach' procedure in selecting sites, in selecting sites, in sequence from the centre. The Buyright application does not conform with this approach.

**3214 Mrs M J Beaumont;3224 Mr B O Beaumont;3244 Mrs J I Wilson;3254 Mr G J Wilson;3567 Mr A C Palmer;3597 Mrs B Sillitoe;3613 Mr S Sillitoe;3623 Mrs J A Whymark;3633 Mrs S A Wood;3922 Mr P Pearce;4285 Mrs Upson;4305 Mr I Bayford;4315 Ms P A Johnson;4917 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4927 Mrs H J Biggs;4937 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7432 Mr B Stacom 7442 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal;7452 Mr T Budd;7462 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal;7472 Mr W Cole;8660 Mr K W Grimsey;8670 Mrs P I Grimsey;8693 Mrs C A Bell;8703 Mr A H Bell**

There is little, or no, evidence to show that the people of Hadleigh want a supermarket on the Buyright site. There was no mention of the word Buyright on the Ballot paper of Sept 1999 and there has been no ballot held since.

**3215 Mrs M J Beaumont;3225 Mr B O Beaumont;3245 Mrs J I Wilson;3255 Mr G J Wilson;3568 Mr A C Palmer;3598 Mrs B Sillitoe;3614 Mr S Sillitoe;3624 Mrs J A Whymark;3634 Mrs S A Wood;3923 Mr P Pearce;4286 Mrs Upson;4306 Mr W Bayford;4316 Ms P A Johnson;4918 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4928 Mrs H J Biggs;4938 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7433 Mr B Stacom  
7443 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal;7453 Mr T Budd;7463 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal;7473 Mr W Cole;8661 Mr K W Grimsey;8671 Mrs P I Grimsey;8694 Mrs C A Bell;8704 Mr A H Bell**

A supermarket in Boswell Lane does nothing to add to the vitality or viability of Hadleigh, or to the High Street shops. In fact, it would probably draw shoppers away from the High Street.

**3216 Mrs M J Beaumont;3226 Mr B O Beaumont;3246 Mrs J I Wilson;3256 Mr G J Wilson;3393 Mr R T Cornish;3569 Mr A C Palmer;3599 Mrs B Sillitoe;3615 Mr S Sillitoe;3625 Mrs J A Whymark;3635 Mrs S A Wood;3924 Mr P Pearce;4287 Mrs Upson;4307 Mr I Bayford;4317 Ms P A Johnson;4919 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4929 Mrs H J Biggs  
4939 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7434 Mr B Stacom;7444 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal  
7454 Mr T Budd;7464 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal  
7474 Mr W Cole;8662 Mr K W Grimsey;8672 Mrs P I Grimsey  
8695 Mrs C A Bell;8705 Mr A H Bell**

There is a very high proportion of elderly people in Hadleigh, many of whom would find it very difficult to walk between two shopping areas with heavy bags of shopping. Concerned about the distance from the town centre as there are many elderly people without transport.

**3218 Mrs M J Beaumont;3228 Mr B O Beaumont;3248 Mrs J I Wilson;3258 Mr G J Wilson;3571 Mr A C Palmer;3601 Mrs B Sillitoe;3607 Mr B Harvey;3617 Mr S Sillitoe;3627 Mrs J A Whymark;3637 Mrs S A Wood;3926 Mr P Pearce;4289 Mrs Upson;4309 Mr I Bayford;4319 Ms P A Johnson;4921 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4931 Mrs H J Biggs  
4941 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7436 Mr B Stacom;7446 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal  
7456 Mr T Budd;7466 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal  
7476 Mr W Cole;8664 Mr K W Grimsey;8674 Mrs P I Grimsey  
8697 Mrs C A Bell**

Better site allocation on Brett Works.

In the postal ballot of Sept 1999, 40% of the people of Hadleigh voted FOR a Tesco supermarket on the Brett Works site. Today that figure could be higher, now that the access is proposed from Bridge Street rather than the High Street and the concern expressed over traffic congestion no longer applies. Their support for this site should be given greater consideration.

**3220 Mrs M J Beaumont;3230 Mr B O Beaumont;3250 Mrs J I Wilson;3260 Mr G J Wilson;3573 Mr A C Palmer;3603 Mrs B Sillitoe;3609 Mr B Harvey;3619 Mr S Sillitoe;3629 Mrs J A Whymark;3639 Mrs S A Wood;3928 Mr P Pearce;4291 Mrs Upson;4311 Mr I Bayford;4321 Ms P A Johnson;4923 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4933 Mrs H J Biggs 4943 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7438 Mr B Stacom;7448 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal 7458 Mr T Budd;7468 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal 7478 Mr W Cole;8666 Mr K W Grimsey;8676 Mrs P I Grimsey 8699 Mrs C A Bell;8709 Mr A H Bell**

Object to site at Boswell Lane as there is a better alternative site at Brett Works. The Govt Inspector following the Public Inquiry assesses the site as being 'the most suitable available'.

**3221 Mrs M J Beaumont;3231 Mr B O Beaumont;3251 Mrs J I Wilson;3289 Mr G J Wilson;3574 Mr A C Palmer;3604 Mrs B Sillitoe;3610 Mr B Harvey;3620 Mr S Sillitoe;3630 Mrs J A Whymark;3640 Mrs S A Wood;3929 Mr P Pearce;4292 Mrs Upson;4312 Mr I Bayford;4322 Ms P A Johnson;4924 Mr A Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4934 Mrs H J Biggs 4944 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7439 Mr B Stacom;7449 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal 7459 Mr T Budd;7469 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal 7479 Mr W Cole;8667 Mr K W Grimsey;8677 Mrs P I Grimsey 8700 Mrs C A Bell;8710 Mr A H Bell**

Object to site at Boswell Lane as there is a better alternative site at Brett Works. A supermarket on this site together with parking for 200 cars, would draw shoppers to the town centre encouraging 'linked- trips' to the High Street, thereby adding to the vitality and viability of Hadleigh and creating a compact shopping area. 'Fragmenting' the shopping area as proposed by Buyright would be detrimental to the town centre.

**3328 Mr W Bayford;7381 Mr & Mrs Rolfe**

I believe that when our local Co-op store has completed their extension it will have the recommended floor space required. It is strategically placed, close to car parks, smaller shops, post office and banks, giving the individual choice within a very small radius. It is befitting of our historic High street. The society has already provided adequate access for the wheelchair bound. Opposite is Alldays, cannot see any reason for a third foodstore in Hadleigh,

and utterly amazed that Tesco is still fighting to put a foodstore here.

**3432 Ms J A Bignell;4271 Ms J A Bignell**

Objects as believes it is not the right location and Brett Works is the better site, offering a better access with less traffic issues.

**3608 Mr B Harvey;3927 Mr P Pearce;4290 Mrs Upson  
4310 Mr I Bayford;4320 Ms P A Johnson;4922 Mr A  
Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;4932 Mrs H J Biggs  
4942 Mrs J C Clarke/Conditional Withdrawal;7437 Mr B  
Stacom;7447 Mr J M Horsewood/Conditional Withdrawal  
7457 Mr T Budd;7467 Mr L Rampling/Conditional Withdrawal  
7475&7477 Mr W Cole;8663&8665 Mr K W  
Grimsey;8673&8675 Mrs P I Grimsey;8696&8698 Mrs C A  
Bell;8706&8708 Mr A H Bell**

Object to site at Boswell Lane as there is a better alternative site at Brett Works. The site is close to the town centre in line with Govt. directives that supermarkets should be sited as close as possible to town centres, following the 'sequential approach' procedure.

**7668 Mrs J Haylock**

The text in this draft plan relating to shopping in Hadleigh should be amended where appropriate as it does not allow for the fact work has now started on the extension to the Co-op.

**3329 Mrs B Bayford**

Objects, does not think another superstore is needed with Copdock only 10 minutes away.

**3434 Ms J A Bignell**

Opposes because feels that there is not enough room on the site to cater for a supermarket and carpark.

**3780 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal**

Road is inadequate. The High Street end of Calais Street is a bottleneck.

**3781 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal**

We have no footpath on our side of the road. Traffic passing us has doubled so that we now get all from Buyright direction as well as that from High Street, Bridge Street which is worrying close to our home.

**3782 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal**

Traffic increased more with the advent of the housing development on old MOD site and will continue to increase when the new school opens. Dangerous to property.

**3783 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal**

Dangerous crossing the road: Would it be safe for children going to new school?

**3784 Mr N Smith/Conditional Withdrawal**

Extra noise and fumes pollution will be even more intolerable.

**4239 Mr R T Cornish**

Objects because feels the Brett Works site provides better parking.

**4268 Ms J A Bignell**

Objects because feels Brett Works site has a better location and is more accessible for the elderly.

**4270 Ms J A Bignell**

Objects as believes Brett Works is the better site and will enhance the riverwalk.

**4905 Mrs P Smith**

Whilst traffic through the High Street has been one of the main objections in past discussions, what about the people in Pykenham Way & Calais Street, already the road has been narrowed outside Hadleigh Tyres. Access to this location from Benton Street would still probably be via the High Street the same stretch of road that would be used if located at the Riverside site.

**4906 Mrs P Smith**

Elderly people having to walk to Buyrights and back would probably find it less traumatic to catch a bus in Magdalen Road and go to Sainsburys which involves little walking. Even if there is a courtesy bus anyone with say a prescription to leave or pick up from the chemist would have to break their journey and wait for another bus.

**4907 Mrs P Smith**

To site the supermarket at Buyrights it may as well be in Ipswich. With the new school and housing estate and the existing store it is much easier for people to avoid going into the High Street and just go a few miles up the bypass to any of the Ipswich stores, thus making the High Street a ghost street. Parking at the supermarket stores is easier than trying to get a space in Magdalen Road.

**4909 Mrs P Smith**

Object to proposal as there is a better alternative on the Brett Works site. It is central, it will be landscaped. As an OAP shopping is an expedition where I can meet a few friends, and shop more cheaply than in existing shops.

**4910 Mrs P Smith**

Object to proposal as there is a better alternative on the Brett Works site. The Brett works at the moment is a rat infested eye sore and using wildlife as an excuse is ludicrous, the hills and hedges are covered in wildlife areas and any waterfowl would just have visitors to feed them, this could be a lovely area, it does not have to be plain brick wall and car parks, we all have to shop and somewhere to sit afterwards would be a bonus. Get rid of this outdated eyesore and use it to give the majority of Hadleigh people what it wants a supermarket in a central spot with easy access.

**5295 GO-East**

Land at Calais Street, Hadleigh is allocated for development of a supermarket. In September 2001 the First Secretary of State accepted that there was a need for additional convenience

floorspace in Hadleigh. However, he rejected development in this location owing to its significant impact on town centre stores. The First Secretary of State, at that time, also concluded that development of a supermarket in this location should not be pursued even in the absence of alternatives. We therefore request deletion of this allocation.

**5322 GO-East**

Policy TP04a and HD01a include the phrase "as shown on the Proposals Map". The regulations require that proposals are illustrated on the map and this wording can accordingly be deleted when the plan is edited before adoption.

**5372 Suffolk County Council/Conditional Withdrawal**

Policy HD01a allocates land at Aldham Mill Hill, Hadleigh, for a food supermarket. In terms of the sequential test in Structure Plan policy ECON10, the Brett Works site adjoining the town centre would be preferable to the Buyright site, which is away from the centre. The County Council therefore considers that the allocation of that land, which is adjacent to the Buyright store is contrary to PPG6 and Structure Plan policy ECON10, but recognises that there may be other local issues that the district council will need to take into account.

**5373 Suffolk County Council/Conditional Withdrawal**

In the event that this allocation is ultimately confirmed the sixth bullet point of policy HD01a should also include reference to public transport publicity being provided.

**5643 Suffolk Preservation Society**

The society asks whether the allocated site is sufficient to take into account any possible future extensions which may be needed for the store along with enlarged car parking facilities.

**5644 Suffolk Preservation Society**

Would urge that a development brief be prepared and adopted to guide the implementation of this proposal.

**6950 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Object to Policy HD01a on the basis that there is no need for the proposed supermarket up to 2500 sq. metres.

**6951 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

In Policy HD01a the proposal is for a food supermarket up to 2500 sq metres. On the Key proposal is described as the Hadleigh superstore. The proposal is not for a superstore which according to terminology for retail development contained in Annex A of PPG6 is a building with more than 2500 sq metres trading floor space.

**7295 Hadleigh Town Council**

As a matter of textural accuracy the site is in Calais Street not Aldham Mill Hill.

**7315 Mrs G M Gordon**

I do not support the proposal that the Buyright site should be the place where a new supermarket is developed.

**7316 Mrs G M Gordon**

Currently the Brett works site is a disgrace and the plans by Tesco to landscape and develop it would provide the means of improving the site while giving Hadleigh a supermarket with varied produce and a wide range of quality products in the town centre.

**7382 Mr & Mrs Rolfe**

I fear the amount of traffic that a supermarket will create in our town. The volume of traffic in the town centre and surrounding streets are hazardous for pedestrians Calais Street would also be a very dangerous place.

**7383 Mr & Mrs Rolfe**

I believe that if this proposal goes through our lovely town will go the same way as so many more have gone in the country. Small shops will not survive. Hadleigh will be poorer place without the small business.

**7664 Mrs J Haylock**

While believing that the Buyright site is preferable to any other site in Hadleigh for a supermarket as it is now in the centre of housing estates, will have no impact on the conservation area or the river, we object to it on the grounds that it will seriously damage the vitality and viability of the High Street.

**7665 Mrs J Haylock**

We do not believe there is a need for a supermarket although some people may want one. We are more than adequately served with a wide variety of supermarkets within twenty minutes drive that can also be reached by public transport. The supermarkets themselves are always seeking new sites in order to maintain their market share but the proliferation of supermarkets appears at last to be of concern to the Competition Commission.

**7666 Mrs J Haylock**

The shopping survey undertaken by Colliers CEE says that Hadleigh is in a good state of retail health. The town centre performs best in relation to food shopping and its small food stores and other specialist shops are its main strength. A new supermarket with its aggressive selling will have a detrimental effect on the small shops - not only those selling food and drink but also chemists, florists, newsagents etc. It can be seen in many small towns around the country that the arrival of a major supermarket leads to the closure of independent shops. Colliers do not consider this effect in their report which could, in the worse case scenario, bring about a net deficit in convenience food floor space giving less choice for shoppers leading to a decline in the attraction of the town as a shopping area. This would, of course, have a knock on effect with

empty listed buildings in the prime shopping area where Policy HD03 states that non-shopping uses will not be permitted. Contrary to claims made by Tesco at the Public Inquiry, Colliers confirm that Hadleigh is too small and too close to Ipswich to attract retail development from multinationals. We ourselves have experienced the damaging effects a large store, able to demand much higher discounts from manufacturers, can have on small independent shops. In view of the low growth in housing proposed for Hadleigh there is no need for another supermarket once the Co-op extension is completed.

**7672 Mr G Rolfe**

My whole hearted opinion and I have been a resident of Hadleigh for 52 years is that the town should not have a supermarket at all and refer you to the situation at Stalham in Norfolk, Tesco's were allowed to build a town centre store and now many established shops are closed and boarded up.

**8270 Mr T W Wiles/Conditional Withdrawal**

I object to the proposed supermarket for Hadleigh being sited at Aldham Mill.

In 2002 the Public Inquiry Inspector preferred the Brett Works site subject to design and access issues being resolved. In my opinion the design issue could be overcome by negotiation with the Council and an alternative access to Bridge Street has been identified.

**8271 Mr T W Wiles/Conditional Withdrawal**

I object to the proposed supermarket for Hadleigh being sited at Aldham Mill.

The Aldham Mill site will have an adverse effect on the High Street retail sales due to its remoteness therefrom and difficulty with linked shopping trips on foot. The new location and cosmetic treatment promoting the High Street will not in my opinion compensate for this remoteness problem and will have a more serious effect on the High Street than Brett Works.

**8272 Mr T W Wiles/Conditional Withdrawal**

I object to the proposed supermarket for Hadleigh being sited at Aldham Mill. The 80% of Hadleigh people identified by the Retail Survey for shopping in Ipswich would not access Aldham Mill from the improved road from the bypass. They would use Boswell Lane and Calais Street which are both single lane at some point or the congested Pykenham Council Estate, thus causing chaos. This is far more unsatisfactory than the current proposal for access to Brett Works site.

**8273 Mr T W Wiles/Conditional Withdrawal**

I object to the proposed supermarket for Hadleigh being sited at Aldham Mill. A supermarket and associated landscaping on the Brett Works site would be excellent use of a derelict brownfield site.

**8274 Mr T W Wiles/Conditional Withdrawal**

Better alternative site for proposed supermarket on Brett works with access from the High Street or Bridge Street.

**9340 Mr P E Brookson**

This allocation would be of no benefit whatsoever to the established town centre and would infact have a detrimental influence in building up an out of town site.

**9341 Mr P E Brookson**

**9503 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

I object as I feel an alternative site at Brett Works would be more beneficial.

**9342 M W Partridge & Co. Ltd./Conditional Withdrawal**

Objects as it would draw customers away from the High Street.

**9357 Mr G Gordon**

I strongly object to the removal of the Brett Works site. There are good reasons for the site to be sensitively developed.

**9358 Mr G Gordon**

The proposed development at the Brett Works site is an exciting plan for a rundown part of the town and would bring a good quality shop to Hadleigh.

**9359 Mr G Gordon**

Other proposals (the Co-Op and Buyright sites) will still not prevent people from shopping away from Hadleigh in cars. Nor will the Buyright site offer help for those who can not rely on cars.

**9397 Environment Agency/Conditional Withdrawal**

A Flood Risk Assessment should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of PPG25. Appropriate wording should be incorporated under this policy to account for this.

**9502 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Object to the location at Aldham Mill Hill.

**9505 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Plan should explain in detail how the measures identified in Policy HD01a will mitigate the serious effects of developing a new food store at the identified location.

**9506 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Getting the level of public transport access to the site at a suitable level is likely to involve substantial funding and will risk making the proposal unviable, i.e. objectives of PPG6 paragraph 1.1.

**12254 Mr D L Williams**

Better alternative site at Brett works providing access problems can be overcome it is the only place in Hadleigh to be considered. It will provide the facilities needed, generate income to the town and utilise what is now derelict and non productive space.

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy HD01a Pre-Inquiry Change 2** *(Please refer to Chapter 11 section 11.12 for objections to change)*

**HD01a**

~~A site of 1.27 hectares on Aldham Mill Hill adjacent to the existing Buyrights store, as shown on the Proposals Map is proposed for a food supermarket of up to 2500sq metres, subject to:~~

- ~~• The store including only food and ancillary retail sales, excluding a pharmacy and any other form of service outlet which might undermine the vitality and viability of retail in the High Street;~~
- ~~• Food retailing ceasing from the Buyrights store;~~
- ~~• Funding environmental improvements in Hadleigh High Street, to create a more pedestrian friendly environment and enhance the conservation area;~~
- ~~• Funding tourism information boards at the council car parks and tourism promotion of the town to help offset loss of trade in Hadleigh High Street;~~
- ~~• Provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle links to Hadleigh High Street, together with signing;~~
- ~~• Provision of a information boards at the super market site showing the pedestrian and cycle links and promoting the shopping, car parking and tourism opportunities within the town centre;~~
- ~~• Provision of town centre and tourism information signing from the bypass;~~
- ~~• Provision of a commuted sum for the improvement of public transport to serve the development;~~
- ~~• Agreement that the car park be available for use by any member of the public and be managed with the same regime as other car parks in the town;~~
- ~~• The operators entering into a route management strategy with respect to deliveries."~~

**HD01b A site of 3.7 hectares between Pound Lane and Bridge Street, as shown on the proposals map is proposed for a food supermarket of up to 2500sq metres, subject to:**

- Provision of a well designed scheme which will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the sensitive riverside environment;**
- Provision of a well designed landscape scheme to be managed in accordance with a Landscape Management Arrangement;**

- **Provision of an access to Bridge Street which minimises the impact on residential property and residential amenity;**
- **Provision of measures to mitigate any loss of residential amenity;**
- **The store including only food and ancillary retail sales, excluding a pharmacy and any other form of service outlet which might undermine the vitality and viability of the High Street;**
- **The environmental improvement of pedestrian links to the High Street, including the improvement and provision of public access to the area north of the churchyard and west of Church Walk;**
- **Provision of the area north of the store development as an area of public open space as shown on the proposals map;**
- **Replacement of any loss arising from access provision to the district council offices car parking, storage facilities and the public allotments;**
- **Provision of a commuted sum for the improvement of public transport to serve the development;**
- **Agreement that the car park be available for use by any member of the public and be managed with the same regime as other car parks in the town;**
- **Provision or funding of measures to promote employment opportunities for the Hadleigh area;**
- **A flood risk assessment being undertaken; and**
- **Provision of information boards at the supermarket site showing the pedestrian and cycle links and promoting the shopping, car parking and tourism opportunities within the town centre.**

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.13.1 The Buyright site is no longer an allocation and most of these objections have been met. See my report above on the Brett Works site and adjoining land.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Modify the Plan by replacing Policy HD01a by HD01b. Also see my report on the Brett Works site above.

---

11.14 POLICY HD01

## **The Objections**

### **857 QD-Buyright/Carpenter Planning Consultants**

Following the Secretary of State's decision on the proposals for additional retail floorspace in Hadleigh, a re-assessment of retail policy as it affects Hadleigh is required. QD/Buyright are currently reviewing the site's development strategy, and may require an amendment.

### **1380 English Heritage**

This policy needs to be updated to take into account the recent Secretary of States decision.

### **1716 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons**

Definition of "modest" as up to 1,400 sq m needs review and clarification.

### **2592 Mrs J Haylock**

"Modest" scheme should be no more than 1,200 sq m. Riverside Meadows should be protected from any new retail schemes. Attractiveness of Hadleigh comes from the choice of small shops.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.14.1 Policy HD01 has been superseded by Policy HD01a and subsequently by Pre Inquiry Changes (Set 1) Policy HD01b by allocating the Brett Works site.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

~~See my report on the Brett Works site.~~

---

11.15 PARAGRAPH 11.16 TRAFFIC

## **The Objections**

### **20 Mr R Burt**

Stonehouse road car park is very underused at present, and would represent the best site for more off-street parking.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.15.1 Paragraph 11.16 aims, among others, to provide adequate off street car parking. How a particular car park is used is not a matter for a Local Plan policy.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

11.16 PARAGRAPH 11.17 HADLEIGH HIGH STREET SERVICING

**The Objections**

**1019 Hadleigh Town Council**

Fails to say that very limited progress has been made with resolving the problems caused by traffic and the servicing of shops in Hadleigh High Street.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.16.1 This paragraph merely refers to the methods available to resolve the problem. It would not be appropriate to discuss progress or a programme of works in a Local Plan

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.17 POLICY HD02

**1717 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons**

Amend line 6 of policy to read .. street caused by service vehicles, parked cars and...

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.17.1 This policy was deleted at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage. It was too detailed and has been relegate to the supporting text at paragraph 11.17a.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no further modification in response to this objection

---

11.18 POLICY HD02a

**The Objections**

**5645 Suffolk Preservation Society**

The society is concerned that this policy only refers in its current wording to "traffic calming". Given the sensitivity and importance of the High Street we would have thought that other environmental improvements would also have been included. It is important that the policy make reference for the need for the proposals to be introduced taking account of the conservation area status of the High Street and parts of Station Road and Angel Street.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.18.1 This is a simple policy about traffic calming. The Plan is to be read as a whole and there are other policies in the plan which have been specifically included to protect the environment. Policies in Chapter 7 – The Built Environment and Conservation are comprehensive and covers such schemes.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.19 POLICY HD03

**The Objections**

**5641 Suffolk Preservation Society**

The society feels that given the characteristics and size of Hadleigh High Street this policy especially in its amended form is no longer required.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.19.1 From my visits I consider it important to retain firm control over the protected shopping frontages so that the Council is able to fully assess the merits of any change of use from retail to other uses.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.20 PARAGRAPH 11.23 CAR PARKING

## The Objections

### **1027 Hadleigh Town Council**

Are there any options for small parks in Meadows Way and around George Street.

### **1862 Ipswich & Norwich Co-op Society Ltd/Donaldsons**

Add to end of paragraph "for commuter trips in particular"

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

11.20.1 The revised wording is appropriate and was included at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage.

11.20.2 I have no evidence on the locations mentioned above, except the statement in paragraph 11.23 that sites for extra car parking are not available and alternative methods of transport will be encouraged.

## RECOMMENDATION

Make no further modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.21 PARAGRAPH 11.23b CAR PARKING

## The Objections

### **7297 Hadleigh Town Council**

The Town Council continues to oppose the idea that the Local Plan should include reference to one particular employers parking problems and to provide a policy to extend its staff/visitors car park. Whilst the policy in the first draft has been deleted this same intention now appears as text. It believes all employers to make some arrangements for staff/visitors parking but support for such arrangements should not form any part of a local plan.

### **7565 Mrs M K Newman**

If there is traffic congestion now why did Tesco say 'no problem' when wanting an entrance to Brett works site there.

### **9477 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

PPG 13 states as one of its objectives the need to reduce the need to travel by car and to promote sustainable transport choices. The aim of these paragraphs should not therefore be to meet the need but to reduce the demand for car parking spaces. The paragraph should be redrafted to reflect guidance in PPG13.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 11.21.1 In my view a Local Plan should identify problems which need to be solved during the plan period. The District Council is not just an employer, it provides a public service to the whole district. Many of the smaller villages have inadequate public transport and visitors to the offices, particularly those from the rural areas, will continue to use cars. The potential for using public transport is limited as is the promotion of sustainable transport modes capable of covering the whole district. Overall in the Plan the Council is aiming for sustainable solutions in accordance with PPG13 but I accept that there is a specific problem which may need to be met in Hadleigh. I understood from Inquiry that car sharing for staff and home working is being considered.
- 11.21.2 I saw from my visit that the parking and congestion problems were in Ann Beaumont Way and Coram Street. Bridge Street is protected by parking restrictions.

## RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

### 11.22 PARAGRAPH 11.23c CAR PARKING

#### The Objections

##### **7298 Hadleigh Town Council**

The Town Council continues to oppose the idea that the Local Plan should include reference to one particular employers parking problems and to provide a policy to extend its staff/visitors car park. Whilst the policy in the first draft has been deleted this same intention now appears as text. It believes all employers to make some arrangements for staff/visitors parking but support for such arrangements should not form any part of a local plan.

##### **9478 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

The paragraph should be redrafted to reflect guidance in PPG13.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.22.1 See 11.23b above

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.23 POLICY HD05

### **The Objections**

#### **1029 Hadleigh Town Council**

Hadleigh has very few open spaces in the centre and it is important to protect those especially those close to the High Street. The opening words in the final sentence should be strengthened to protect these small green areas against opportunist development.

#### **3011 Mr R A Smith**

The Hadleigh Bowls Club occupies a prime site for more sheltered housing and car parking. Yet an alternative site exists between the swimming pool and East House (the unused but council maintained putting green). The Hadleigh Bowls Club has been offered £20 000 by the District Council and £5000 by Hadleigh Town Council towards a new pavilion but has failed to gain lottery money. Suggest that the existing area of Hadleigh Bowls club be purchased and any existing leases terminated and the land be designated for sheltered housing and possibly car parking.

#### **7296 Hadleigh Town Council**

The Town Council objects to the deletion of the final sentence in the first draft. The absence of this wording clearly indicated that it will be acceptable to develop town centre irrespective of the environmental impact to the area. The environmental impact of developments of all types must be taken fully into account. Town centres need to retain open spaces as these help to give life and room around such built-up areas for the local community.

#### **7850 The Hadleigh Society**

The proposal to permit residential development in Hadleigh's town centre does not give sufficient emphasis to the effect that such a development could have on the character and amenity of the conservation area. Reinstate the wording that was deleted or add wording that emphasises the importance of the conservation area.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.23.1 The objection in respect of the bowls club does not require amendment to the policy. The Council would consider such a proposal against the criteria in the policy.
- 11.23.2 The environmental impacts of the development, on amenities, open space and biodiversity are covered by other policies of the plan. As the Plan is read as a whole the last sentence was deleted to avoid duplication.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.24 PARAGRAPH 11.25 OPPORTUNITIES FOR HOUSING AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT

#### **The Objections**

##### **28 Mr R Burtt**

Babergh District Council needs to govern its future car parking facilities much more responsibly and not expect a Policy to accommodate them with one. Overspills of on-street vehicles, in connection with the Council, are affecting approaches to local residential areas.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.24.1 Paragraph 11.25 has been deleted. I have dealt with this matter above when responding to objections to paragraph 11.23b

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no further modification in response to this objection

---

### 11.25 POLICY HD06

#### **The Objections**

### **933 The Hadleigh Society**

Paves the way for increasing car parking for the District Council employees, adjacent to its headquarters. Since the majority of the cars are long stay parked there is no necessity for these to be adjacent to the place of work and a park could be created elsewhere. Officers should consider and implement ways of reducing journeys in line with their stated aims elsewhere in the document.

### **1254 Mrs M K Newman**

Babergh District Council should be leading the way and setting an example for other people by introducing a greener transport system.

### **1294 Mrs J Byrne**

It seems unreasonable that the needs for parking by Babergh staff should be given special treatment. Babergh should encourage staff living in Hadleigh to walk or cycle to work. Should also encourage car sharing and running bus service for staff.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.25.1 This policy has been deleted. It covered matters which should be in the supporting text and have now been included in paragraphs 11.23b and 11.23c which I have commented on above.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no further modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.26 PARAGRAPH 11.26 THE OLD POST OFFICE, CHURCH STREET

## **The Objections**

### **1718 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons**

Clarification needed of what is pedestrianised.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.26.1 This paragraph was deleted at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.27 POLICY HD07

**The Objections**

**1251 Mrs M K Newman**

Disagree with proposal to residential use if current use is no longer required.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.27.1 This policy was deleted at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.28 PARAGRAPH 11.28 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT  
SCHEMES

**The Objections**

**1235 Miss A Stephenson**

The medieval water meadows, which pre-served the historic high street from inundation needs to be mentioned in the local plan.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.28.1 This paragraph is a general statement about enhancing the conservation area. What projects would be involved would be for the Council to determine.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.29 PARAGRAPH 11.29 CHURCH WALK AND POUND LANE

**The Objections**

**1719 Ipswich and Norwich Co-Op Society/Donaldsons**

Delete all but the first sentence in view of the Secretary of State's decision.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.29.1 I consider that the first two sentences should be retained as they are linked. However, the remainder of the paragraph has been deleted.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.30 POLICY HD08

**The Objections**

**1643 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

Improvements to these routes are desirable in their own right and can be secured as part of nearby redevelopment to provide the foodstore set out in an amended version of HD01.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.30.1 This policy has been deleted. I accept the improvement of these routes is desirable and it is still mentioned in the supporting text. I have also commented on Church Walk in my report on the Tesco foodstore in this chapter.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.31 PARAGRAPH 11.29a CHURCH LANE AND POUND LANE

**The Objections**

**9524 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Objection 1643 maintained:

Improvements to these routes are desirable in their own right and can be secured as part of nearby redevelopment to provide the foodstore set out in an amended version of HD01.

However, now in respect of 11.29a

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.31.1 Paragraph 11.29a accepts that the improvement to Church Walk may or may not be linked to the adjacent foodstore proposal. See also my report on the Tesco foodstore in this chapter.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.32 INSET MAP 10

### **The Objections**

#### **6658 Hadleigh Town Council**

The recently constructed access to the Industrial Estate from A1071 is shown as a roundabout whereas the Highway Authorities have refused this solution.

#### **6660 Hadleigh Town Council**

Error on map as it does not include the approval to extend the 'built-up area' to the north of the former Partridges site near the Green.

#### **6942 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Object to the key in relation to Inset 10, there is no "site of 1.27 hectares on Aldham Mill Hill adjacent to the existing Buyright store as shown on the Proposals Map.

#### **6943 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

In Policy HD01a the proposal is for a food supermarket up to 2500 sq metres. On the Key proposal is described as the Hadleigh superstore. The proposal is not for a superstore which according to terminology for retail development contained in Annex A of PPG6 is a building with more than 2500 sq metres trading floor space.

#### **6944 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

On the Key policy in relation to the "Hadleigh superstore" is HD01 and not HD01a

**9504 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Object to the allocation of the Aldham Mill Hill location on the proposals map.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.32.1 The access should not be a roundabout and this was corrected by pre-inquiry change 7.
- 11.32.2 I have reported on the changes to the Built Up Area Boundaries in the Introduction to the Housing Chapter of the plan. I tend to agree that once planning permission is granted there is no reason why the site should not be included within the BUAB.
- 11.32.3 With the change of foodstore site Inset Map 10 is no longer relevant. Neither is Policy HDO1a which has been deleted.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Modify the plan by including the former Partridges coach depot site off The Green within the Built Up Area Boundary. See below for other updating of Inset Maps

---

11.33 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry Change 6**

update base map to show existing development east of Aldham Mill Hill (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

**The Objections**

None

---

11.34 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry Change 7**

correct base map to remove roundabout shown on A1071 (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

### **The Objections**

None

---

11.35 INSET MAP 10

### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry Change 8**

delete supermarket allocation and associated servicing area, landscaping and access shown near roundabout on Aldham Mill Hill (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

### **The Objections**

#### **13135 The Hadleigh Society**

Object to deletion of supermarket allocation near roundabout on Aldham Mill Hill as the Council did not pass a resolution to delete this allocation.

#### **13142 Hadleigh Town Council**

This objection is part of a general objection to the allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Reasons for objection: new accesses will adversely impact on historical buildings, private residences, allotments and increase risks in floodplain. Development will adversely affect Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area and sensitive riverside environment. Long-term adverse impact on vitality and viability of High Street trading. Damage to residential amenity and significant increases in light and noise pollution within Conservation Area.

#### **13150 Kersey Parish Council**

General objection to supermarket on Brett Works site. Further details awaited.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.35 See my report on the Tesco foodstore elsewhere in this chapter. Pre-Inquiry Changes 1 to 15 (set 1) deal with Council resolutions and corrections.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Changes**

11.36 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry  
Change 9**

increase area shown as being covered by Inset Map 10a (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

**The Objections**

None

---

11.37 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry  
Change 10**

insert "See inset map 10a" within enlarged box (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

**The Objections**

None

---

11.38 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry  
Change 11**

show the Conservation Area (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

**The Objections**

None

---

11.39 INSET MAP 10

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10 Pre-Inquiry  
Change 12**

insert north pointing arrow (see revised Inset Map 10 for details).

## **The Objections**

None

---

11.40 INSET MAP 10a

### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10a Pre-Inquiry Change 14**

Show Conservation Area

## **The Objections**

### **13143 Hadleigh Town Council**

This objection is part of a general objection to the allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Reasons for objection: new accesses will adversely impact on historical buildings, private residences, allotments and increase risks in floodplain. Development will adversely affect Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area and sensitive riverside environment. Long-term adverse impact on vitality and viability of High Street trading. Damage to residential amenity and significant increases in light and noise pollution within Conservation Area.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.40 See my report on the Tesco food store elsewhere in this chapter.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

11.41 INSET MAP 10a

### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Inset Map 10a Pre-Inquiry Change 15**

Insert north pointing arrow

## **The Objections**

### **13144 Hadleigh Town Council**

This objection is part of a general objection to the allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Reasons for objection: new accesses will adversely impact on historical buildings, private residences, allotments and increase risks in floodplain. Development will adversely affect Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area and sensitive riverside environment. Long-term adverse impact on vitality and viability of High Street trading. Damage to residential amenity and significant increases in light and noise pollution within Conservation Area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.41 See my report on the Tesco food store elsewhere in this chapter

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.42 PROPOSALS MAP

#### **The Objections**

#### **7663 Sqn Leader J N Bloomfield**

None of the maps forming part of Babergh Local Plan Alteration 2 Second Deposit Draft May 2003 show the delineation of the Hadleigh Conservation Areas or the Special Landscape Areas.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.42 The Special Landscape Areas were already shown on Maps 10 and 10a. The Conservation Areas were included by Pre-Inquiry Changes 4 and 11.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Modify the Proposals Map in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Changes 4 and 11

---

### 11.43 PROPOSALS MAP

### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Proposals Map Pre-Inquiry Change 3**

On the Proposals Map Key following changes made:  
Delete "Superstore" and replace it with "Supermarket"

#### **The Objections**

##### **13158 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Objection: On the proposals key map, delete any reference to a superstore or supermarket.

Reason: On the basis that there should be no new allocation.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.43 See my report on Tesco foodstore elsewhere in this chapter.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

#### 11.44 PROPOSALS MAP

### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Proposals Map Pre-Inquiry Change 4**

On the Proposals Map Key following changes made:  
Insert appropriate annotation for Conservations Areas (CN02a)

#### **The Objections**

**13140 Hadleigh Town Council** This objection is part of a general objection to the allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Reasons for objection: new accesses will adversely impact on historical buildings, private residences, allotments and increase risks in floodplain. Development will adversely affect Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area and sensitive riverside environment. Long-term adverse impact on vitality and viability of High Street trading. Damage to residential amenity and significant increases in light and noise pollution within Conservation Area.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.44 See my report on the Tesco food store elsewhere in this chapter

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

### 11.45 PROPOSALS MAP

#### **B.D.C is proposing a change to Proposals Map Pre-Inquiry Change 5**

On the Proposals Map Key following changes made:  
Delete "HD01a" after "servicing"

#### **The Objections**

##### **13134 The Hadleigh Society**

See representation 13135. We do not consider that the Brett works site is suitable for a supermarket and the Buyright site should stray the preferred site.

##### **13141 Hadleigh Town Council**

This objection is part of a general objection to the allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Reasons for objection: new accesses will adversely impact on historical buildings, private residences, allotments and increase risks in floodplain. Development will adversely affect Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area and sensitive riverside environment. Long-term adverse impact on vitality and viability of High Street trading. Damage to residential amenity and significant increases in light and noise pollution within Conservation Area.

##### **13149 Kersey Parish Council**

General objection to supermarket on Brett Works site. Further details awaited.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.45 See my report on the Tesco food store elsewhere in this chapter

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

## 11.46 OMISSIONS

### **The Objections**

#### **21 Mr R Burt**

Current plans that will affect existing schools by extending them will be totally inadequate to absorb new influxes of pupils when the Aldham Mill Estate is completed shortly.

#### **1010 Hadleigh Town Council**

There is concern about the absence of any reference to the medieval water meadows behind the historic High Street in Hadleigh. The meadows should become a protected recreation area not allowed to be covered in concrete. The local plan needs to reflect this situation by extending its policies to include protection for these meadows in the future.

#### **1644 Mr and Mrs J Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates**

There is no recognition within Hadleigh of the need to establish a District Centre in the northern part of the town to service the requirements of the major residential developments previously allocated and now being implemented.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 11.46.1 This was a matter for consideration at the planning application stage. As I understand it appropriate contributions were made towards the new primary school to ensure adequate provision
- 11.46.2 The protection of the environment and its biodiversity are already covered by other policies in the plan. Provision for enhancement schemes are also included in Chapter 7 – The Built Environment and Conservation.
- 11.46.3 I have no evidence before me that there is a need to establish a further district centre to serve this market town. Such development would be in competition with the centre which is accessible from most parts of the town and is intended to provide for day to day needs.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

## 11.47 GENERAL

### **1016 Hadleigh Town Council**

Certain aspects raised in this chapter are outside area designated as town centre as on map with Alteration No1. Did town centre extend to include Benton, Angel and part of Bridge street? If so, it should be clearly stated in text and also be extended to include all of Magdalen RD and more of George Street and Station Rd.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

11.47.1 The streets mentioned are not considered by the Council to comprise part of the town centre in policy terms.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

## **Appendix**

### **13000 Suffolk Preservation Society**

Objects to proposed change which allocates the Brett Works site between Pound Lane and Bridge Street for supermarket. The Society supports construction of a supermarket on the Buyright site and considers that the Brett Works site should have an alternative use and one which is more beneficial to the local environment and general community.

The society would like to see an up-to-date assessment of shopping requirements. This would need to take into account of recent announcements relating to the future of the Buyright site as well as the changes to shopping patterns which have already taken place following the opening of the enlarged Norwich and Ipswich co-operative Society. The new assessment must not simply repeat now out-of-date information and forecasts and should be comprehensive and based on new empirical information.

The society does not consider the site and access to it are actually available for development as a supermarket. The council has not indicated that it will use its compulsory purchase powers if necessary against those owners who do not wish to sell their land to enable to the development to take place. The conclusion must be that the Brett Works site cannot be developed for a supermarket and should not therefore be allocated for such.

Given the importance and potential impact of any supermarket, the society ask for a full EIA to be prepared.

**13001 Mrs S Monks**

Town will be unable to sustain two supermarkets in the same street, shoppers will not multi shop. Detrimental impact on existing local shops leading to closures.

Unacceptable access via Bridge Street a narrow road and the flow of traffic across the bridge and then swinging into the entrance.

Impact on residential properties on Bridge Street.

Environmental and noise pollution issues.

**13002 Mr A O'Reilly**

Unsuitable site location. Objection to the congestion that will be caused in Bridge Street and running back into High Street. However it is arranged there will be a constant turning against the stream of traffic. Impact on the quality of the environment. The spoiling of the River Walk, it would lose it's charm with an alien building blotting out one side. Impact on the town centre shops leading to closures and loss of jobs. Damage to a very attractive town character.

**13003 Mrs A O'Reilly**

Detrimental impact on the medieval high street and the riverside walk.

Additional traffic congestion in High Street and Bridge Street.

Some years ago the government decreed that supermarket should be built outside towns, within 10 miles of Hadleigh there are two such stores. Hadleigh residents would take almost the same time battling through a clogged up High Street to get to a riverside supermarket. Site is within a flood plain.

**13004 Mr R B Sutherland**

Objects on grounds of: Loss of vitality and viability of the town centre.

Pound Lane not being an acceptable pedestrian access. The bad access from the already busy Bridge Street and increased traffic generation.

The spoiling of the riverside walk.

**13005 Mr R A Smith**

Object on grounds of:

Never formally consulted those affected in Hadleigh and the surrounding district. No has it taken into account the town poll of some years ago. It has not considered other options. Most land south of the by-pass is now within the built up area boundary. These are a clear economic benefit if a much larger supermarket than is proposed at the Brett works were developed as prices would be more competitive, public transport passes the site(s) and there is the opportunity to fill in the fuel-less gap on the A1071 between Sudbury and Ipswich. New planning guidelines allow supermarkets to expand without further planning permission. This is intolerable on the Brett works site. Detrimental environmental impacts.

**13006 Mr & Mrs R Burtt**

Object to supermarket on Brett Works site. Erosion of health and safety through increased traffic levels; harmful to vitality and viability of central Hadleigh's trading position; flood plain vulnerability; environmentally damaging, particularly regarding Hadleigh Conservation Area.

**13007 Mr W Bailey**

Objects on grounds of increased traffic generation, congestion and traffic back up to the High Street, access route, service road, noise and pollution including light pollution. Impact on the local vicinity and High Street residents. Detrimental impact on the conservation area, listed bridge, riverside area and wildlife and the historic core of the town. Loss of allotments and car parking at Babergh District Council and demolition of dwelling for new service road.

Siting of supermarket should be on the present Buyright site as it would overcome most of the above concerns.

**13008 Mr A J Freeman**

Objects to deletion of policy HD01a and replacement with HD01b on the grounds of: No change since the rejection of the previous Tesco application. No reason for the council to reverse its earlier decision to have the Buyright site designated. Disruption and environmental impact on properties that will be affected in the creation of the entrances to the site and increase in traffic flow what would be caused in the High Street or Bridge Street. Large delivery lorries will be continuously disruptive. Brett works site should be used for affordable housing.

**13009 Mrs Y D Freeman**

Objecting to deletion of policy HD01a and replacement with HD01b on the following grounds: Impact on the town centre viability and vitality, character of the market town, impact on market traders, proposed entrances to the site from Bridge Street will be disruptive to traffic flow and pedestrians, Town poll made it clear the majority of residents prefer Buyright site easily accessed from A1071, nothing has altered to justify the Council's change of policy.

**13010 Mrs G Pryor**

Object to inclusion of supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the grounds of: Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, the co-op has already expanded to provide a larger store for the town. Dangerous entrance on Bridge Street as it is very close to the High Street turning, Increased traffic will put pedestrians at risk. Impact on the local vicinity, historical character, riverside walk and wildlife.

**13011 Mr B J Clements; 13012 Mrs S G Clements**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: against the wishes of local people, access would be problematic and would lead to additional

traffic generated from the supermarket and its related activities, extra traffic generated from the High Street/Calais Street junction into Bridge Street will lead to problems with the pedestrian footways, pedestrian safety on and around the bridge and Pound Lane and Queen Street. Noise and light pollution, visually intrusive from the riverside walk, impact on nearby residential properties, flood risk and impact on the vitality and viability of local shops.

**13013 Ms W Knight**

Object to deletion of HD01a and to proposed policy HD01b on the following grounds: Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, character of the town, traffic generation to the proposed entrances would be disruptive and unacceptable to the town and neighbouring houses along Bridge Street. Preferred site was Buyright with access from A1071, nothing has altered to justify the council's change of policy.

**13014 Mr & Mrs T Bishop**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: Inappropriate location for such a scheme, impact on the riverside, increased traffic congestion, danger to pedestrians, noise, impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and town character. An alternative site away from the High Street would be preferred.

**13015 Mrs M Hall**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: Access is extremely difficult even from near the Bridge in Bridge Street. More traffic, including heavy delivery lorries will be encouraged into the centre of the town in addition to that now expected following the Co-op extension. Impact on the riverside walk by large building and car park with lighting visible on the opposite side. Impact on the historic town centre.

**13016 Mr M Pryor**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: The size of the new Co-op and the expanded range that they will now offer it is ridiculous for another supermarket to be allowed to open in Hadleigh, surely the size of the town does not warrant such a scheme. Impact on the vitality and viability on the town centre. Dangerous entrance on Bridge Street close to the High Street turning, increased traffic generation and pedestrian safety.

**13017 Mr R J Hibbert**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: Smaller supermarket would offer less choice than superstores do the majority of shoppers would still shop at Copdock. Impact on town centre vitality and viability, impact on local employment new jobs created would be offset by

ones lost, increased traffic, noise, pollution and damage to town buildings, building within the floodplain, impact on riverside walk and local wildlife, access, loss of allotments and impact on residential properties. Additional retail floorspace in Hadleigh is not needed.

**13018 Mrs P Bloomfield**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Council has reversed policy twice after Brett Works site was dismissed previously. Hadleigh is a very special Historic Town and protecting its ancient core must be of utmost importance. Site is on environmentally sensitive river bank, close to listed buildings and Conservation Area. Development would ruin views across river from riverside walk, light and noise pollution would desecrate a haven of peace and tranquillity rich in wildlife and could have severe implications for flooding lower down the river. Need for any allocation of land for a supermarket is questioned. Leakage of shoppers from Hadleigh to Ipswich should not be a consideration. Traffic noise, fumes and congestion would severely affect quality of life of neighbouring residents.

**13019 Mr & Mrs P Higon**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: No material change since similar proposals were rejected, site and development impinges on a conservation area, the building is out of character with Hadleigh, impact on the vitality and viability of the town, roads cannot sustain the traffic personal and heavy goods, unacceptable levels of noise, traffic fumes and light pollution. Perfectly acceptable alternative location at Calais Street/Buyright with reasonable road access within easy reach of the High Street currently designated in the Local Plan.

**13020 Mr G Sutcliffe**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: This site had been rejected in favour of the Buyright position and can see no reason for change, the impact on the river side, the proposed new access and pollution issues.

**13021 Mr & Mrs G Morgan**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: The inadequacy of the access from Bridge Street together with all the loss of amenities by the river, light pollution and developing a natural area makes the proposal totally unsuitable.

**13022 Mrs W Morgan; 13023 Mr A Morgan**

Object to the allocation of a supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the following grounds: Residents have made it abundantly clear they do not want a supermarket on this site. If a

store is needed then it should be on the Buyright site which is central to the town since recent building has taken place and will be conveniently placed for future developments northwards. Proposed design will impact unfavourably on the built environment of the High Street and Bridge Street, will destroy the riverside walk and green area adjacent to the Babergh offices. Site is liable to flooding, design is hideously inappropriate for the centre of a town with such historic and environmental value. Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. Increased traffic generation leading to major congestion, the approach from Bridge Street and the Iron bridge is just not suitable for the weight and frequency of traffic that would be engendered. Loss of properties in part or whole and town allotments. It would be totally inappropriate for property to be purchased compulsorily from owners unwilling to sell. Do not believe that the need for a superstore in Hadleigh has been established. The extended Co-op will meet most of its needs. If another store is required then the Buyright site is central, convenient for access and would not impact so unfavourably on the built or natural environment.

**13024 Mr J Bloomfield**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Council has reversed policy twice after Brett Works site was dismissed previously. Hadleigh is a very special Historic Town and protecting its ancient core must be of utmost importance. Site is on environmentally sensitive river bank, close to listed buildings and Conservation Area. Development would ruin views across river from riverside walk, light and noise pollution would desecrate a haven of peace and tranquillity rich in wildlife and could have severe implications for flooding lower down the river. Need for any allocation of land for a supermarket is questioned. Leakage of shoppers from Hadleigh to Ipswich should not be a consideration. Traffic noise, fumes and congestion would severely affect quality of life of neighbouring residents.

**13025 Mr K Mirams**

Objecting to proposal for supermarket on Brett Works site. A development of the size and nature of a Tesco store will not enhance the charm and quality of the lower part of the town from the High Street to the river. The development would be at the expense of the small traders and destroy local competition.

**13026 Ms S Ashton**

Object to proposal for a supermarket on the Brett Works site for the following reasons: traffic in the town centre - volume, noise, pollution, danger; traffic in Bridge Street - sudden increase in traffic will significantly decrease quality of life; traffic jams caused by lorries turning; traffic in the periphery of the town; visual pollution of the river walk.

**13027 Mr S Merrick**

Object to supermarket being jammed between High Street and Nature area by the river. We need LESS traffic in Bridge Street. The path from the High Street is narrow and the corner from High Street is already very dangerous. How can anyone think about putting a supermarket next to a Conservation Area? It's crazy.

**13028 Mr R A O'Reilly**

Objecting to supermarket on Brett Works site. Already too much traffic on Bridge Street and in High Street. River Walk is a haven of peace and wildlife - please do not allow anything to spoil the view or add light pollution.

**13029 Mrs G Alvarez; 13030 Mr D Alvarez**

Objecting to supermarket on Brett Works site and proposed access from Bridge Street. Do not believe there is a need for another supermarket in the centre of Hadleigh. Access from Bridge Street is unsuitable and will cause extreme congestion. Proposal will damage riverside walk and will increase the probability of flooding. Concerned about impact on local shops and increase in traffic in town.

**13031 Miss L Ashton**

Object to proposal of a supermarket on the Brett Works. Concerned about impact on character of town and Riverside Walk. No room in Hadleigh for more cars, let alone lorries and it is already dangerous to walk on some of the narrow paths.

**13032 Mr J Jackson**

Objecting to deletion of HD01a and insertion of HD01b which allocated the Brett Works site for a supermarket. Concerned about effects on shops in High Street and inadequacy of access in Bridge Street area. Extension of Co-op has made further town shopping facilities less necessary. Concerned about increase in traffic congestion and impact on listed buildings and Conservation Area, and visual and noise impact on Riverside Walk.

**13033 Ms A Davey**

Object to deletion of Policy HD01a and insertion of HD01b which allocates Brett Works site as a supermarket. Concerned about increase in traffic, damage to Conservation Area, impact on Riverside Walk and wildlife in the area, and impact on existing shops.

**13034 Mrs J Bayliss**

Objecting to supermarket on river site. Concerned about effect on the town, damage to riverside walk, traffic, flooding and wildlife.

**13035 Hadleigh Town Council**

Object to supermarket on riverside site on several grounds: site is in a Conservation Area and is of national importance, proximity of ancient buildings, impact on small shops, increase in traffic and impact on riverside walk.

**13036 Mrs W Partridge**

Objecting to supermarket proposal. Concerned about impact on small shops, increase in traffic on High Street, impact on riverside walk, flood risk and threat to historic buildings.

**13037 Mrs G Dunn**

Objecting to supermarket on Brett Works. The Buyright site is a better choice. Shops in High Street would be forced to close. Concerned about impact on Conservation Area, river bank and residential amenity.

**13038 Mr & Mrs B Woodberry**

Object to supermarket on river site. Concerned about increase in traffic in Bridge Street and High Street, disruption to wildlife and danger to pedestrians. Building on floodplain should not be allowed. High Street will be full of empty, boarded up shops.

**13039 Mrs D Jarvis**

Objecting to allocation of Riverside site for a supermarket. Will result in loss of the small shops that make Hadleigh a proper thriving working town. Riverside walk will be ruined by noise and light pollution. Bridge Street will be unable to accommodate large container lorries in addition to increase in car traffic. Floodplain will be unable to cope with flooding in the normal way.

**13040 Mr J Betteridge**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Site has poor access for large numbers of vehicles and lorries that would be involved. Peaceful riverside walk would be spoilt by noisy vehicle and fumes. Development on floodplain would give rise to dangers of flooding. Concerned about detrimental effect on Conservation area and small shops. Would prefer Buyright site for a supermarket.

**13042 Mrs P C Messenger; 13043 Mr E V Messenger**

Object to proposed deletion of HD01a and insertion of HD01b. Supermarket will inevitably lead to closure of small businesses in High Street and ruin the character of the town, riverside walk and Conservation Area. Additional heavy traffic will be a disaster for the town.

**13044 Mr & Mrs M Meeks**

Objecting to allocation of Brett Works for supermarket. Could affect flood plain and cause flooding to low lying housing. Roads will not be able to cope with increased volume of traffic and would incur a danger to pedestrians. Concerned about damage to Conservation Area and preservation of riverside walk which would be affected by noise and excessive light. Buyright site is preferable.

**13045 Mrs C R Foster**

Object to deletion of HD01a and insertion of HD01b. Would result in smaller shops having to close and would spoil the riverside walk.

Increased traffic would put schoolchildren's lives in danger. Also added risk of floods. Whole site is unsuitable for a supermarket.

**13046 Mr A C Gerard; 13048 Mrs A Gerard**

Objecting to pre-inquiry changes relating to Hadleigh supermarket. The proposed development will increase traffic significantly, and vehicles will cause significant traffic problems. Concerned about flooding. Riverside walk would be spoilt. Object to any proposal that concretes over the allotments and forces owners from their home, as well as any possible changes to the land attached to the listed buildings in this Conservation Area. Proposal will have an adverse effect on High Street shops and turn it from a vibrant place to a row of empty shops.

**13047 Mrs H C Bawden**

Object to decision to allocate Brett Works for a supermarket. There is no proven need for an extra supermarket in Hadleigh. The site has no safe pedestrian route and is inappropriate for any development with major traffic generation or 24 hour disturbance. A building with the mass and volume of a supermarket will not enhance the Conservation Area. The pollution will be damaging to the sensitive riverside area. New access road from Bridge Street would create unacceptable increase in traffic; compromising safety, damaging the Conservation Area, polluting the allotments, disturbing the peace and tranquillity of the riverside walk nature reserve and destroying the setting of the High Street listed buildings.

**13049 Mr H C Keele**

Object to allocate riverside site for a supermarket. Concerned about threat to local shops and listed buildings. Traffic congestion will bring Hadleigh to a complete standstill. Buyright site would be more suitable.

**13050 Mrs L Whetlor**

Object strongly to proposal of allocating riverside site for a supermarket in the Local Plan. Infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional traffic involved. Nothing in plan about how Bridge Street will be altered to cope with very large volume of extra traffic. Hadleigh is a charming, country market town with many delightful historic buildings. How sad it would be if such a lovely town was ruined.

**13051 Mr S J Whetlor**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket and the proposal to make an access from Bridge Street to the Brett Works site.

**13052 Mrs G E Holloway**

Proposed supermarket will spoil a lovely corner of Hadleigh and also the Riverside Walk. The feelings of peace and tranquillity will be lost, all for the sake of businessmen.

**13053 Mr R F Holloway**

Objecting to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket, for the following reasons:

effect on small shops that would be forced to close; damage to amenity of riverside walk both visually and by increased noise levels; disruption caused by access from Bridge Street; extra traffic in Bridge Street and the High Street; dangers of pedestrian access from Pound Lane or Queen Street; risk of flooding and effects of building on floodplain; scale of development will change nature of town; effect on Conservation Area.

**13054 Mrs A Cox**

Say no to Tesco, keep Hadleigh delightful for all who visit.

**13055 Mr & Mrs D McCoid**

Objecting to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Small local shops will be unable to compete and will be forced to close. Amenity value of the riverside walk will be lessened and there will be an increase in noise levels and light pollution at night. Will be increased disruption to traffic and additional traffic will increase risk to pedestrians and children walking to school. Use of Pound Lane and Queen Street for access will also increase risk to pedestrians. Expansion of existing Co-op will reduce need for another supermarket. Concerned about building on floodplain and negative impact on the Conservation Area.

**13056 Mr T Lowenstein**

Object to supermarket on riverside. Will threaten livelihood of independent shops on the High Street and would almost certainly change the character of the town. Extra traffic on the High Street is another concern.

**13057 Mr H Rivington**

Objecting to proposal to include a supermarket by the river. It is likely to cause flooding along the Brett at some stage. The newly enlarged Co-op is more than adequate for local needs. A large development will ruin the character of the town and cause major traffic problems in the High Street. Many shops will go out of business leaving us with vacant shops in the High Street.

**13058 Ms A Goldsmith**

Objecting to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Would have terrible effect on local businesses and force them to close. Would ruin character of Hadleigh and the town already has sufficient supermarkets. Development on the riverside would cause severe damage to the local environment. Increased traffic, noise and visual changes would spoil the local environment. Increased traffic would be a hazard to pedestrians, particularly children walking to school. Proposed site would increase risk of flooding in this area.

**13059 Mr P Perrin**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. We do not need another supermarket. The town of Hadleigh is currently a beautiful unspoilt market town and if this store were to be allowed it would be a step on the road to bland. Would have a terrible effect on local businesses in the High Street. Increased traffic and noise levels would be very disrupting and spoil the local environment. The proposed site would also increase the risk of flooding.

**13060 Mrs C L Smith**

Object to plan to build a supermarket on the river bank. Concern over impact on town - closed shops/lost livelihoods, increased traffic, noise, pollution and risk of accidents, reduction in choice, increased dependence on mass produced foods. New jobs created will be outnumbered by old jobs lost as small businesses go down. Riverside amenities will be permanently blighted by noise and light pollution. Concerned about increased traffic movement in the High Street.

**13061 Mrs E Hodgson**

Proposal to develop a central site by the river will greatly increase traffic within the centre of the town and will pose a danger to pedestrians, especially schoolchildren. Alternative access via the allotment site would be a loss of a valuable local community amenity. Development would damage unique character of the High Street, forcing the closure of many small businesses. Concerned about increased risk of flooding and damage to the riverside walk.

**13062 Mrs F H Breyer**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket on the grounds of: effect on the small shops, damage to the riverside walk, traffic disruption and the change to the nature of Hadleigh.

**13063 Mrs E Mirams**

To put a supermarket by the river would be totally inappropriate. Many of the local shops would inevitably close. Concern about flood risk. Freightliners in the area would be a constant danger both to traffic, especially cyclists, and pedestrians.

**13064 The Conservation Bureau**

We our position in preferring the Buyright site for an additional supermarket. It will not impact on the Conservation Area or the sensitive landscape area between the High Street and the River or add to flood plain concerns. It already has car parking facilities and good access unlike the Brett Works site, which is totally inappropriate for a supermarket and large car park and will have all sorts of detrimental knock-on consequences which will not preserve or enhance the town.

**13065 Mr & Mrs W Oldroyd**

Object to inclusion of supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the grounds of: It's unsuitable for such development, it's within the floodplain, detrimental effect on other properties, impact on

conservation area and listed buildings, impact on landscape, increase in traffic and heavy delivery lorries, impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.

**13066 Mrs J Groves**

Object to inclusion of supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the grounds of:

There is already a suitable site at the Buyright location which is outside the conservation area which is outside the conservation area and is not on the floodplain. It has an existing road straight off the by-pass, leading to roundabout which filters traffic. It would avoid further substantial loss of habitat which has already occurred due to building new houses and a new school close by. Nothing altered to justify the Council's change of Policy. Flooding of the area and pollution of the River Brett. Unsuitably off Bridge Street and High Street danger to pedestrians, traffic problems through Gallows Hill, Bridge Street, Benton Street. Detrimental effect on small shops in the town, destruction of ambience. Compulsory purchase of private dwelling, unsuitable access points.

**13067 Mr J C Hall**

Object to inclusion of supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the grounds of:

Vehicular access to the site, access from Bridge Street will create a dangerous and difficult junction. The large delivery vehicles, the obstacles and dangers that a junction at this point will present to pedestrians travelling between the town and the housing west of the bridge should be regarded as unacceptable as adults as well as school children use that route.

The logical access to town for large delivery vehicles would be from the A1071 via B1071 Gallows Hill. The junction is not designed to accommodate large volumes of traffic, there being no 'turn-off' lane on to the A1071. The access routes designed for such traffic do not provide convenient access of Bridge Street.

Gallows Hill residents have no alternative to parking on the carriageway therefore because of the limited width of the road the route into town at that point is effectively reduced to one way traffic resulting in queuing, particularly those leaving the town.

People have made their wishes clear in a referendum in which the greater majority were against a supermarket at the Brett Works site, especially since a more viable alternative is available.

**13068 Mr & Mrs Belling**

Objects as it will affect the small shops and damage the amenity of the riverside walk. Increased traffic at Bridge Street and High Street. Disruption caused at Bridge Street and it appears to be within the flood plain. It will affect the conservation area. Residents prefer the Buyright site also because of the loss of allotments and possible demolition of two properties in Bridge Street.

**13069 Ms S Martin**

Objects as doesn't want a large supermarket at all, let alone on the beautiful riverside. Likes to use leisure time walking along the riverside which would be ruined by a development.

After receiving 'Your district, your future', was interested to read 'Village shops, pubs and other facilities are closing' and 'Quality of the environment' and considers these issues would be made a lot worse. Shops and amenities will close due to unfair competition and the quality of the environment will hugely be affected. Strongly believes it will be detrimental to the town. Lastly, a supermarket like Tesco can only mean it being the first step to creating yet another spiritless area lacking individuality.

**13070 Mr & Mrs McIntosh**

Objects on grounds that it's the Riverside Walk and amenity, also the traffic and noise pollution. Bridge Street is inadequate to carry the traffic which would be generated and there would be considerable distraction. Overall, the unique atmosphere of Hadleigh, a small comfortable working town with some of the finest architecture in Suffolk, would be greatly damaged by the intrusion of such a development into its midst. There is no need for another supermarket as there are already adequate retail outlets in the town to cater for everyday needs. Those who want wider choice only have to travel 15-20 mins to Ipswich, Sudbury, Sproughton or Copdock.

**13071 Mrs M Jeffery; 13072 Mr I J Jeffery**

Object to inclusion of supermarket on the Brett Works riverside site on the grounds of:

Road safety - the proposed plan is not adequate for this level of vehicular access nor does it safeguard schoolchildren.

Small shops would be forced to close, changing the nature of the town. The effect on the conservation area, including the riverside walk, both visually and in the increase of noise levels, also severe light pollution at night. The loss of allotment land at a time when clearly there is an increased demand nationally for this amenity. The danger for pedestrians using Pound Lane and Queen Street for access to the site. Allowing building on the flood plain must surely increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Nothing has altered to justify the Council's change of Policy. The Town Poll made it clear that a majority of residents prefer the Buyright site.

**13073 Mr O Neary; 13074 Mrs A Neary**

Objects on the grounds of:

The effects on small shops which may be forced to close.

The damage to the amenity of the riverside walk both visually and through increased noise levels. The disruption caused by either of the proposed entrances to the site from Bridge Street. The extra traffic in Bridge Street, with the increased danger to pedestrians,

particularly children walking to and from school. The dangers of using Pound Lane or Queen Street for pedestrian access to the site. The risk of flooding and the effects of the building on the flood plain. The scale of the development which will change the nature of our beautiful old market town. The effect on the Conservation Area. Nothing has altered to justify the Council's change of Policy. The Town Poll made it clear that a majority of residents prefer the Buyright site. There is a rich diversity of wildlife all along the riverside walk.

**13075 Mrs B Warren; 13076 Mr W E Warren**

Objects to the proposal of allocating the Brett Works site for a supermarket is incompatible with the conservation area in which it is situated and in relation to the town's heritage centre.

The size of such a proposed development and its situation in relation to the town centre would be out all proportion with Hadleigh's needs as well as totally detrimental to its surroundings. The noise pollution generated by the presence of the proposed store would be detrimental to the immediate location and to those living on approach routes through the town.

Hadleigh's road infrastructure does not have the capacity to carry the increased level of traffic that would be generated.

The town's parking problems would be exacerbated by this proposal.

**13077 Mrs M E Smith**

Object to supermarket by the riverside. Concerned about increase in traffic and parking issues. Also impact on small shops and riverside walk.

**13078 J R McCrae**

Tesco open stores primarily for the benefit for their shareholders and any benefit to the local residents is incidental. Concerned about impact on High Street shops. Calais Street site would be more feasible.

**13079 Dr M C Willingale**

**13080 Mrs D J Willingale**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Why do we need another supermarket? Concerned about increase in traffic and parking problems. Local small businesses will be priced out and will close. Increased employment possibilities will be outweighed by number of businesses and owners and employees who will lose their livelihoods. The riverside will be despoiled, and there will be problems of flood control in the future.

**13081 Mr and Mrs J Davis**

Objecting to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket, for the following reasons: disruption in Bridge Street and High Street, where there are many listed houses; risk of flooding; effect on Conservation Area; and increase in traffic in town.

**13083 Mr C Drake**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Have been no material changes to justify change in policy since previous decision. Concerned about flooding. Access from Bridge Street will be inadequate and will cause congestion problems. Extra traffic along Bridge Street and High Street will be a hazard to other traffic and pedestrians and is undesirable in a conservation area. The Riverside Walk will be adversely affected by noise and light pollution. Pedestrian access from Pound Lane and Queen Street raises pedestrian safety issues.. Supermarket will have adverse effect on small shops.

**13084 Miss A Stephenson**

Object to building of supermarket on Brett Works site, on grounds of effect on wildlife, impact of increased traffic noise and pollution on residents of High Street. Level of lighting needed would shatter the peaceful outlook and be intrusive all night. There are several omission from Map 10a.

**13085 Mr D Williams**

Objecting to proposed development of riverside. Main objection is effect that huge increase in traffic would have in town centre. Entrance from Bridge Street will create a hazard to motorists and pedestrians alike. Also concerned about effect on local shops and environmental damage.

**13086 Mr & Mrs P Vardon**

Objecting to supermarket on Brett Works site. Traffic - both routes from Bridge Street are unacceptable on safety grounds. Pollution - the Brett will be at risk from spillage. Exhaust fumes and traffic noise will be a hazard to residents and light pollution may also be anticipated. Parking - loss of designated car park will render position unsafe.

**13087 Mr K Abbott**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for supermarket. Concerned that the entire shopping environment will change. Also concerned about amount of extra traffic that will be generated. Siting of supermarket on riverside will produce much noise and will completely spoil such a tranquil spot.

**13088 Mr W D Milner**

Objecting to proposed supermarket on riverside site. Main arguments are likely adverse impact on High Street traders, inevitable increase in traffic flows and disruption in town and loss of amenity to the riverside walk.

**13089 Mr T J Angland**

Object to supermarket on Brett Works site. Concerned that development on floodplain will increase risk of flooding in the future. Will materially harm the look of the historic town. Very concerned about the chaotic effect on the traffic in Bridge Street and the High Street.

**13090 Mr B Haylock**

Objecting to HD01b. There is no need for another supermarket in Hadleigh, which would severely damage the vitality and viability of the High Street. A supermarket would not enhance the Conservation Area and would lead to considerable increase in traffic in the High Street. Impact of lighting, noise and fumes on property. Bridge Street too narrow to cope with increased traffic. Serious impact on listed buildings and nature conservancy and the protected river bank. Irreparable damage to view across the meadows, and serious danger of flooding.

**13091 Mrs S J Angland**

Object strongly to proposed building of supermarket on Brett Works site. Peace and tranquillity of riverside will be shattered. Natural beauty of the riverside walk will be ruined by pollution. Fail to see how supermarket will bring any enhancement to the conservation area. Access is inadequate. Concerned about impact on town centre and small shops.

**13092 Mr K Abbott**

Object to decision to recommend building of a supermarket on Brett Works site. Riverside site is totally unsuitable and supermarket would spoil the character of historic Hadleigh.

**13093 Ms J Haylock**

Challenge need for another supermarket in Hadleigh. To claim that not providing a site would encourage unsustainable journeys to Ipswich and Sudbury is nonsense. No way a supermarket would improve setting of conservation area or enhance riverside. Would have unacceptable impact on wildlife and riverside walk. Access from Bridge Street would have serious impact on residential amenity. Supermarket will undermine the vitality and viability of the High Street. Concerned about impact on listed buildings. Development will lead to considerable number of trees being felled in the conservation area. Concerned that development on floodplain is likely to cause problems with flooding on the river. Will be net loss of jobs because of closure of independent shops.

**13094 Mrs J Partridge**

Object to riverside site for a supermarket. Concerned about extra traffic. Effects on small shops will be significant and will put some out of business. Impact on conservation area - supermarket would spoil this lovely area and town.

**13095 L Garrod**

Object to site for a supermarket by the riverside. Concerned about building on floodplain. Area proposed is an amenity to the town in providing walks and bird watching. Any of access possibilities would bring chaos to Bridge Street/High Street and put very old buildings at risk. Only sensible site for a supermarket is close to the bypass.

**13096 Mr G Rolfe**

Object to supermarket on Brett Works site. With all extra traffic generated, congestion and tailback are bound to occur. Will put High Street shops under pressure and no doubt will eventually have to close.

**13097 Mrs M Chambers; 13098 Mr W S Chambers**

Object to deletion of HD01a and insertion of HD01b. Development adjacent to conservation area here wildlife will be driven out by light and noise pollution. Increased flood risk and devastation of local High street shops. Insufficient road system through listed areas.

**13099 Mr & Mrs D & A Brodie**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Impact on High Street Conservation area, destruction of peaceful riverside walk, impact on wildlife, increase in traffic in High Street and noise nuisance.

**13100 Mr D Coster**

Object to proposed deletion of HD01a and substitution with HD01b. Allotment holders face prospect of loss of a valuable amenity. Building of another supermarket is not necessary. Development would have adverse effect on nature and character of town. Bridge and connecting roads are inadequate to cope with a large increase in traffic. Noise and light pollution will have adverse effect on conservation area and could increase risk of flooding.

**13101 Mr G Panton**

Do not believe that Brett Works site is suitable for a supermarket. Do not believe that satisfactory access from Bridge Street is feasible. Will lead to major traffic increase in Bridge Street and Gallows Hill. Building on flood plain is significant risk. Loss of amenity destroying tranquillity of riverside. Object to rigid application of sequential approach without taking into account the special local situation. Special character of the town would be destroyed by a supermarket.

**13102 Mr Peter Jarvis**

Object to supermarket on riverside site. Detriment to the town would be to destroy all that is best in Hadleigh. Concerned about loss of a peaceful amenity, the noise and light pollution, loss of small shops, increase in traffic in Bridge Street and building on flood plain.

**13103 Ms Gill Clairereaux**

Object to plans for supermarket on riverside site. Increase of traffic along Bridge Street and resulting damage to houses along Bridge Street. Lack of access to site. Damage to riverside area and wildlife through noise and pollution.

**13104 Mr & Mrs A & S Parker**

Objection to development of Brett site for any form of supermarket. Damage to retail outlets in High Street will be profound. Access from Bridge Street represents severe problems with road safety and

will have deleterious effect on residents in the locality. Resultant noise and car pollution will have adverse effect on environment and listed buildings. Concerned about downstream effect of building on floodplain. Increased traffic movements will impact enormously on the whole town. Allotment holders will be severely affected. Town does not have infrastructure or capacity to handle a supermarket, or the need for it.

**13105 Mr A D Herrington**

Express support for the supermarket proposal on the Brett works site as the most suitable and best placed location to support the town centre, to provide additional parking for the town centre and enable shopping needs to be met locally without the need to travel to other towns however I raise the following objections:

requirement for public open space in area north of proposed supermarket allocation - no evidence of need for new POS in this part of Hadleigh with already generous provision. Object to countryside designation resulting from supermarket proposal - the definition of countryside on the proposals map does not adequately recognise the function of land currently outside the built-up area boundary once the supermarket access road is built.

**13106 Mr & Mrs M Eastman**

Objects to the inclusion in the district plan of a proposed supermarket on the site behind Hadleigh High Street for the following reasons:

Architectural-impact on listed buildings. Environmental-noise and light pollution and on the floodplain. Increased traffic on High Street and access to site. Increased danger to school children and cyclists. Retail impact-impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. Also impact on the historic and archaeological value of the town.

**13107 Mrs J Ratliff**

Objects as it means demolition of a dwelling and this is morally wrong and insupportable, just in order to build a commercial store. There will be tremendous disruption of traffic entering Hadleigh from the Sudbury and Bildeston direction. A store on the proposed site will ruin Hadleigh as a market town. At present Hadleigh has an interesting selection of successful trading outlets, this will change. The store will not ease the parking problems which Hadleigh experiences and make the situation much worse than at present. Also any pedestrian access using Pound Lane has very obvious dangers. It will look unsightly from the other side of the river and the riverside walk is an asset which visitors from other towns envy. It is a peaceful place within a short distance from the town centre.

**13108 Mrs J R West**

Objects to Policy HD01b Pre-Inquiry change to the Local Plan on the Brett Works site. - No other comments given.

**13109 Mr & Mrs P Garrod**

Strongly objects on the grounds that:

A high profile store on that site would attract road traffic from the surrounding area into an already extremely busy and thriving shopping street.

The existing privately owned small shops in the High Street offer a friendly and adequate service and a large store as proposed could jeopardise their business.

Bridge Street and High Street junction has already become a very busy area, extra traffic would cause many problems.

Using Pound Lane for pedestrians could cause problems at the busy junction of the High Street and Angel Street, which is already the site of several accidents.

It also seems extremely inappropriate to build and concrete over large areas near a floodplain.

**13110 Mrs P L Davidson**

The old Brett Works site is an eye-sore on the banks of the beautiful River Stour but the character and charm of the river remain, the site could easily be tidied up. A supermarket however would destroy the atmosphere of the place. The river walk would be damaged losing sense of tranquillity. You can not deprive future generations of this precious heritage. Such areas of natural beauty should sustain. Another supermarket is no fair exchange. Also, apart from the damage to the River Walk the scale of development proposed is unsuited to a conservation area. The proposed entrance to the supermarket from Bridge Street would greatly increase the volume of traffic and present a hazard to motorists and pedestrians. There is a danger of flooding and nothing has altered to justify the Council's change of Policy. A town poll showed the majority of the residents prefer the Buyright site. For bulk shopping transport is needed anyway, despite however conveniently situated the supermarket is and the little shops in the High Street will see a disastrous decrease in the trade, you only need to look at other market towns in Suffolk to see the detrimental impact that it would have on the heart of a town. Hadleigh with its river walk, old buildings and little shops is a gem, you at Babergh are trusted for its safe keeping.

**13111 Mr J Baldwin**

Objects on the grounds that it will affect the vitality and viability of the town and the disruption it will cause to Hadleigh residents and shop keepers alike.

**13112 Mr M Roper; 13113 Mrs S Roper**

Strongly objects as feels that the Brett works site is not suitable for development. Previous studies have shown where a large supermarket comes into a small town, the effect on the existing shops is catastrophic and could lose many of the small shops. The riverside walk is a beautiful place and would be ruined by a building

of this size and the noise and extra traffic generated by this would be detrimental to the whole area. I feel the traffic situation in Bridge Street and the High Street could become appalling and the size of the delivery lorries manoeuvring their way through these small roads would be dangerous for pedestrians and children on their way to school. If Hadleigh is going to have a supermarket surely the obvious situation is the Buyright site, after all this was the preference of the residents in the Town Poll.

**13114 Mr G White**

Objects as it's one of the few remaining market towns in Suffolk. Hadleigh currently provides all the necessary commodities for shoppers in this local area and therefore it does not require this development. Hadleigh has many independent shops and services that Tesco could impact on. Hadleigh High Street provides a convenient, affordable and diverse atmosphere that is connected to the historical past and Hadleigh has strong aesthetic character that requires respect and preservation. The proposed development would detract from its local beauty. Also the local people have continuously opposed to this development and must be listened to when it comes to our future.

**13115 Mr P Alexander**

Objects on grounds of:

Small shops on the High Street will be forced to close.

Small shops closing will not allow shoppers to support buying local food and goods.

Small shop owners will lose their livelihood.

Hadleigh will lose its individualism and be a clone of other Tesco towns.

Devastating effects on the aesthetics of the riverside area.

Damage to the amenity of the riverside walk.

Risk of flooding and effects of the building on the floodplain.

Disruption caused by the entrances to the site from Bridge Street.

Extra traffic in Bridge and High Street.

Extra traffic causing danger to pedestrians and in particular school children.

Potential dangers of using Pound Lane or Queen Street for pedestrian access.

Also, Hadleigh's beauty, character and soul will all be affected if Tesco is built, please consider this historic town.

**13116 Mrs K Alexander**

Objects as will change Hadleigh in a negative way forever. Small shop owners will be forced to close and this will change the character and soul of Hadleigh. The plan to build this site in Riverside area will have devastating effects to the land and aesthetics. There will be damage to the amenity of the riverside walk, risk of flooding and potential problems caused by building on

the floodplain. Lastly, the potential problems caused by extra traffic and access to the site. The extra traffic will be a hazard to pedestrians and school children. Using Pound Lane or Queen Street for pedestrian access will also create potential dangers. Hadleigh has managed to keep its character and offer its community an alternative to large supermarkets.

**13117 Mr A Bell**

Objects to Tesco's being built in Hadleigh as it will have a devastating effect on the town and community. The small shops will not be able to compete with Tesco's and will have to close, the High Street will change forever.

Building Tesco's will have devastating effects on the riverside area, not to mention the damage to the amenity of the riverside walk and the risk of flooding. This plan will also cause extra traffic and access problems to the site as follows: extra traffic in Bridge Street and High Street. Traffic dangers to pedestrians and school children. Many problems will arise from using Pound Lane or Queen Street for pedestrian access. Disruption caused by entering the site from Bridge Street. Hadleigh is a wonderful historic town that has managed to keep its beauty.

**13118 Mrs C Bell**

Objects as it would have a devastating effect on the town and community. Hadleigh is a beautiful historic town and the small shops would not be able to compete with Tescos and would be forced to close. Hadleigh would lose its character. It would dramatically affect the aesthetics of the riverside area, not to mention the damage to the amenity of the riverside walk and risk of flooding. Traffic and access would cause problems too and the extra traffic in Bridge Street and the High Street will cause danger to pedestrians and school children. Using Pound Lane and Queen Street is potentially dangerous. I strongly object and hope Babergh Council supports the community.

**13119 Mr D Charleston**

Objects in the strongest possible terms about the proposed plan to build a Tesco supermarket in Hadleigh as they have the Co-Op as well as a wealth of specialist retailers. It would be a severe blow to the beauty and character of Hadleigh.

**13120 R O Freeman**

Objects to the decision on the following: The damage to the amenity of the riverside walk and the floodlighting of the site at night. The negative effect on the many listed medieval buildings caused by light pollution, the increase in traffic flow, including the heavy articulated delivery vehicles, pollution and noise levels. There is already the Co-Op supermarket - another one seems unnecessary. Another supermarket will do nothing to secure the character of Hadleigh as a small market town and will bring a large

increase in traffic with all the attendant dangers that it would produce to pedestrians and children. The decision will add a significant twist to the urbanisation of this notable market town and deal a blow to the small existing trades who serve the town well.

**13121 Mrs T Brown**

Objects as it would damage the amenity and drive people away with the noise, pollution and traffic that would come with the supermarket. Wants to maintain Hadleigh as a quiet market town. The individual small shops attract customers into town and these would inevitably disappear with Tesco. Concerned about the risk of flooding and the problem moving further down and the lorries and increased traffic on the High Street. Already have the enlarged Co-Op so there is no need for a Tesco, we should be encouraging the small businesses to thrive. A lot of boarded up empty shops will do nothing for the lovely historic buildings in our High Street.

**13122 Ms S Paynter**

Objects as greatly appreciates the diversity and individuality of all the small shops in the High Street and doesn't want them forced into closure. We should treasure our unique town, support local shops who in turn support local people and sell local produce. Tesco had no relationship or interest or emotional investment in Hadleighs heritage or people.

**13123 Mr J Byrne**

Strong objection, reasons for this objection include: The damage caused to the Conservation Area. The loss of amenity caused by changes made to the environment of the riverside and other walks to the west of the town. The increased traffic in the town. The damage and loss of amenity caused by the building of an access road from Bridge Street. The potential damage to listed buildings. The risk of flooding. The rebuilding of all, or part of, the listed bridge. The changes that would occur in the High Street as a result of a new supermarket opening. The Council does not appear to have fully investigated the problems of implementing this changed policy in an acceptable way.

**13124 Mrs J Byrne**

Do not consider Brett Works site to be suitable for a supermarket and find the arguments for it to be flawed. Environmentally and for conservation reasons the site is not suitable. Hadleigh would stand to lose most of its shops, the High Street will be destroyed. Area allocated for public open space will be crossed by the road to the supermarket and would be needed for Babergh's car park and replacement allotments..

**13125 Mr & Mrs G & B Tryon**

Object to proposed supermarket on Brett Works site. Increased traffic in High Street and serious disruption around Bridge Street

area. Heavy freight vehicles and refrigerated vehicles at unsocial hours. Threat of serious loss of trade to existing High Street shops.

**13126 Mr & Mrs Toth**

Opposed to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Traffic concerns - access from Bridge Street is unsuitable and will cause traffic problems. Environmental considerations - effect of noise and lights on Riverside Walk. Impact on existing High Street shops - some of the existing shops in the High Street will be forced to close. Buyright location is preferable.

**13127 Mrs A J McCrae**

Objection to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Concerned that small shops will be forced to close. Damage to local amenities (such as Riverside Walk) - visually and aurally from noise pollution. Disruption caused by extra traffic and danger to pedestrians and children walking to school. Negative effects on conservation area. Building on the floodplain is not wise.

**13128 Revd J Griffin**

Objection to allocation of Pound Lane site for retail development. Concerned that land is readily floodable. Access would be expensive in financial, social and amenity terms. Propose that site be taken into public ownership and converted into an amenity beneficial to the town's resident's and visitors.

**13129 Mr & Mrs Rolfe**

Concerned about access from Bridge Street and danger to pedestrians and children. Extra traffic will have profound effect on whole town. Increased noise levels and disturbance to riverside walk. Small shops will be forced to close.

**13130 Ms J Newble**

Object to proposed supermarket on riverbank. By-pass was built to protect town centre from heavy traffic and these problems would be reintroduced. Effect of noise and fumes on flora and fauna and riverside walk. Existing shops would be greatly affected, and for many, adversely. Suggest site is developed for retirement housing and provide parking for Council employees.

**13131 Mrs C Mellor-Kerr**

Concerned about impact on smaller shops, you might as well rip the heart out of Hadleigh High Street. Impact on potentially interesting and beautiful riverside site. This scheme is not in the best interests of Hadleigh - the shops and shopping, the traffic and the community!

**13132 Hadleigh and District Angling Society**

Object to inclusion in the local plan of a supermarket on the Brett Works site. Would have devastating effect on the River Brett. The peace and tranquillity which exists at present would be lost. Fears that construction will damage river bed, quality of fishing and water quality. Concerned about damage to river and riverside from

vehicle fumes, spillages, discharge, rubbish, oil traps and flooding, noise and light pollution.

**13133 The Hadleigh Society**

Change 1: Deleting and replacing 11.15c and 11.15e opposed to changes for the following reasons: There was no resolution passed by the District Council to remove the Buyright site from the District Plan therefore 11.15c and 11.15e remain valid. Brett works not suitable for a supermarket and the people of Hadleigh made it clear during the consideration of the last Tesco application for the Brett Works site that a clear majority were opposed to it. Against the will of the people of Hadleigh and surrounding district. Change 2: Deletion of Policy HD01a and replacing with new policy HD01b opposed to change for the following reasons history of the site, need and retail assessment, public opinion, effect of the conservation area and SLA, loss of recreational amenity, access problems, pedestrian access, effect on local shops, is within a floodplain, traffic, impact of the building in sensitive area. The resolution passed by the Council made no reference to an access road being built onto Bridge Street. The Council did not debate the issues raised by such a road. Change 13: Object as the Council did not consider whether it was possible to achieve an acceptable access from Bridge Street, the viability of pedestrian access from the High Street or the provision of a public open space. These were not included in the resolution passed by the Council. A 2,073 signature petition (Appendix B) accompanied this submission.

**13136 Littman & Robeson**

Support principle of allocation of Brett Works site for a foodstore development. However have a number of points of objection to pre-inquiry changes. Para 11.15c - objections to wording. Also should appreciate wider implications of not providing a foodstore in Hadleigh. 11.15d is irrelevant in policy terms and should be deleted. Objections to inaccurate wording in 11.15e. Objection to 11.15f - suggest alternative wording for the purpose of factual accuracy and clarity. Objection to HD01b - allocation site area is 2.7ha not 3.7ha when excluding public open space adjacent to allocation. Site should be described as an allocation rather than a proposal. Site of store should be increased to 2900 square metres to take account of increased demand over plan period. Objections to and suggestions for alternative wording of several bullet points. Bullet 3 should refer to "an acceptable access" rather than "an access." Bullet 4 - is unrealistic and should be deleted. Bullet 5 - it is inappropriate for Local Plan to be specific as to what can and cannot be included in store. Bullet 6 - object to second half of sentence, it is inappropriate to require improvement to an unrelated piece of land. Bullet 7 - should be deleted as it is inappropriate to require as part of a foodstore allocation the provision of open space. Bullet 8 -

replacement of 'any loss' is not appropriate; description of car park is inaccurate; replacement of "storage facilities" is inappropriate and is not a matter for the local plan process to deal with; replacing "any" allotments is inappropriate. Bullet 9 - unreasonable to request commuted sum from a development that provides a solution to existing unsustainable transport patterns and sentence should be deleted. Bullet 10 - it is not appropriate to require the car park to be managed with the same regime as other car parks in the town. Bullet 11 - given the advantages the allocation presents, funding for other employment measures is unreasonable and the sentence should be deleted. Bullet 13 - over-detailed criterion for a local plan. Delete sentence.

**13137 Go-East**

More clearly and fully justify why the new site in the High Street (11.15f) as proposed in policy HD01b is the most sequentially preferable location, in accordance with PPG6 of those that were investigated and that the previous concerns about access would be satisfactorily addressed by the proposed alternative arrangements.

**13138 Environment Agency**

Should include note to the effect that flood risk assessment (which would be expected to consider implications of surface water run-off) must accompany any planning application, notwithstanding any previous computer modelling work undertaken in relation to flooding and drainage. Use of sustainable drainage systems would be preferred means for surface water drainage and we would wish to see the incorporation of permeable paving for the car park area. It is not apparent from the supporting text whether the sequential testing was undertaken by reference to PPG3 or PPG25.

**13139 Hadleigh Town Council**

Objects to allocation of a supermarket site on the existing Brett Works site. Final word of paragraph 11.15d is not true and should be deleted. Object to wording of several of bullet points in HD01b.

**13145 Suffolk County Council**

Object to wording of paragraph 11.15f - suggest it should be altered to say: "...overcome these difficulties and the details of the design would be...". Objects to fourth bullet point of HD01b - suggest it should be altered to say: "Provision of safe access to Bridge Street to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority which minimises the impact on residential property and residential amenity."

**13147 Mrs M K Newman**

Objection to allocation of supermarket on Brett Works site. Environmental impact on Hadleigh and further down river would be disastrous with potential flooding and pollution from car park. Concerned about traffic pollution and traffic queuing in Bridge Street, with resultant pollutants very harmful to a lot of people.

**13148 Kersey Parish Council**

An additional supermarket for Hadleigh is not required. Brett Works site is inappropriate for a supermarket, principally for the following reasons: character of town would be detrimentally changed; significant increases in traffic would result; the proposed accesses are unsuitable; valued local shops would be lost; an important nature site and area would be lost; and there would be an increased risk of flooding.

**13151 Mr D Pym**

Hadleigh is one of the last of the provincial towns to offer people a civilised and enjoyable way of life. Babergh should devote their resources to protecting and enhancing the dozens of small enterprises.

**13152 Mrs J M Kelly**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Whichever access is preferred will result in irreversible damage to this attractive area. Concerned about implications of increased traffic volume.

**13153 Mr T B Groves**

Object to proposed supermarket on river site. Concerned about risk of flooding and pollution of river. Impact on conservation area and listed buildings. Traffic problems caused by increase in traffic. Supermarket would be an eyesore in a beautiful area of the town.

**13154 Ms E Judd**

Object to supermarket on riverside site. Would destroy thriving market town and ruin already established local businesses. Would be a disaster for the environment. Concerned about impact of additional traffic and delivery lorries.

**13155 Ms A Young**

Supermarket by the river would not be in anyone's long term interest. Negative impact on High Street shops, the natural world and wildlife and enjoyment of our environment. Ensuing traffic and pollution will degenerate the area and adversely affect the whole community.

**13157 Ipswich & Norwich Cooperative Soc./Peacock Short Property Solutions**

Objection: All paragraphs including those four new paragraphs proposed in respect of the provision of a food supermarket in Hadleigh should be deleted. Reason: On the basis that there is no up to date and relevant assessment of the need for a new supermarket, and, even if there was an identified need, the additional space for food retailing is not the overriding consideration. If meeting that need causes permanent harm to other interests such as landscape, and environmental quality. Objection: Policy HD01a should be deleted and proposed replacement policy HD01b should not be included. Reason: As above, in respect of dealing with an identified need. Objection:

Delete any reference on inset map 10a to shown supermarket allocation on Brett works site. Reason: as above.

**13161 Mrs I Reece**

Detrimental to the life and vitality of the area. We are already well served by a mix of retail outlets in the area. The recently expanded Co-op is excellent. Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and market town character. Increased noise pollution and traffic movements.

**13162 Mrs P Pym**

Loss of town character and impact on the community. Additional supermarket not required. Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. Environmentally it would increase congestion, pollution noise overcrowding.

**13163 Dr J Ord**

Impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, the town character and community. Increased traffic congestion on the High Street. Additional supermarket not required with the Co-op expansion.

**13166 Mr & Mrs Pym**

Objects on grounds of loss of viability and vitality of town centre. Increased traffic will be detrimental to the beauty and peace of the town as well as potentially hazardous for pedestrians, particularly children in Bridge Street and the High Street. Building on the floodplain will have a bad effect on the risk of flooding in that area. Visual impact of the building and signage on the town.

**13167 Mrs H Elliott**

Objects as it will have detrimental effect on the variety of shops in the High Street as well as ruining the beauty and tranquillity of the riverside walk. It will greatly increase traffic congestion in Hadleigh and would only take a few more minutes to drive to Copdock. Why not give the extended Co-Op a chance to prove its worth?

**13168 Mr F H Breyer**

Object to allocation of Brett Works site for a supermarket. Knock on effect of traffic reaching this site will have disastrous consequences for a small town. Town will be destroyed; alleged economic benefits are a myth. Other issues are ecological and visual.